DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 414 CE 017 800

AUTHOR Wurzburg, Gregory
TITLE Improving Job Opportunities for Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act.
INSTITUTION National Council on Employment Policy (DOI), Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 61p.; Some pages in this document may not reproduce well due to broken type

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Career Exploration; Case Studies; Community Agencies (Public); *Demonstration Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; Dropouts; *Employment Opportunities; Employment Services; *Federal Programs; Government School Relationship; Interagency Coordination; *Job Training; Occupational Aspiration; Participant Involvement; Program Development; *School Community Cooperation; Work Experience; Youth Employment; Youth Opportunities; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment Training Act; Department of Labor; Local Education Agencies; *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act; Youth Employment and Training Program

ABSTRACT

This report of the National Council on Employment Policy to the Department of Labor identifies some major themes and analyzes the diverse experiences occurring in ten case studies. The case studies examine a total of thirty-seven prime sponsors (in twelve states) charged with improving job opportunities for youth. "Summary and Recommendations," the first of the report's three parts, draws some tentative conclusions about the effectiveness of prime sponsors and the Department of Labor in implementing the new youth programs and offers some guidance for forthcoming operations. Part 2, "The National Picture," presents the national background to the prime sponsor experience. It analyzes national level conditions and national office policy's direct effects on prime sponsor plans and experiences. The third part, "Experiences at the Local Level," analyzes the case study patterns with reference to the objectives of the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs. In this major portion of the report, there are reviews of knowledge development, work experience quality under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act, youth participation, targeting, substitution, coordinating services for youth, involvement of community-based organizations, and changes in institutional relationships. (CSS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159414

CE

IMPROVING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH:

A REVIEW OF PRIME SPONSOR EXPERIENCE IN IMPLEMENTING THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ACT

CE 017 800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	i
Acronyms and Abbreviations	v
Summary and Recommendations	1
The National Picture	5
Experience at the Local Level	8
Knowledge Development	8
Quality of Work Experience under YEDPA	13
Youth Participation	22
Targeting	25
Substitution	31
Coordinating Services for Youth	35
Involvement of Community Based Organizations	42
Changes in Institutional Relationships	43

PREFACE

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act was signed into law August 5, 1977, marking the start of an expanded attack on the problems of youth unemployment. The new law, which amends the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and, for the bulk of its efforts, looks to the CETA local government sponsor system, introduces several departures from other CETA planning and implementation processes. It stresses more innovation and experimentation on the part of prime sponsors than CETA does, but also provides for several more specific procedural and eligibility requirements than is customary under CETA.

Four programs are authorized under YEDPA. Three have been created under the Youth Employment Demonstration Program, a new part added to the existing Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. One is authorized under a new CETA title: The Young Adult Conservation Corps, Title VIII.

The Youth Employment Demonstration Program creates 3 demonstration programs for providing employment opportunities and employment support services, and for testing the relative effectiveness of alternative remedies to youth employment problems. The basic purpose of the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects is to test whether guaranteeing jobs for 16-19 year-old economically disadvantaged youths will effectively encourage those in school to stay, and those out of school, to return. Seven prime sponsors have been selected by the Department of Labor to test this notion with saturation projects conducted under a variety of conditions, using different approaches. Ten other prime sponsors have been selected to operate smaller projects, limited to testing specific innovative ideas. The Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP) are being created to provide job opportunities for unemployed youths, 16-19 years old, doing well-supervised work with tangible outputs that are of benefit to the community. Although these projects are not reserved for economically disadvantaged youth, prime sponsors are encouraged to give them special emphasis in selecting participants. The Youth Employment and Training Program is designed to provide a full range of work experience and employability development services for youths. They are supposed to be targeted for disadvantaged 16-21 year old youths, who are in school or are out of school and unemployed or underemployed. Under certain provisions, some 14 and 15 year old youths may participate, as well as some non-disadvantaged youth. Prime sponsor programs under this subpart are expected to link up with local education agencies, so that the base of resources for youths can be broadened, and so, perhaps, some of those resources can be better coordinated. Funds for efforts under both YCCIP and YETP are allocated by formula to all CETA sponsors. In addition to the formula allocations, there are discretionary monies. They constitute about 25 percent of the total funds available under YCCIP and YETP, and are earmarked to support research and special demonstration projects.

The Young Adult Conservation Corps has been established to provide jobs and some supportive services to unemployed youth who can be engaged in doing needed conservation work. These activities are conducted under the

authority of a tri-partite agreement among the Departments of Labor, Agriculture and Interior.

YEDPA was funded at a level of $1 billion for its first year. The Congress appropriated $223 million for the first year of the Young Adult Conservation Corps, $115 million for the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects, $115 million for the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects and $537 million for the Youth Employment and Training Program.

In order to get an ongoing picture of how implementation of YCCIP and YETP prime sponsor activities is proceeding, the Department of Labor selected the National Council on Employment Policy to do a four-part evaluation. In designing its evaluation, the Council adopted a case study approach. Ten case studies are being prepared by knowledgeable observers for each of the four reports. Each case study examines three to five prime sponsor areas. The evaluators are studying a total of 37 prime sponsorships in 12 states. The sample was chosen, not as a random one, but to represent a cross-section of important prime sponsor characteristics. The selection purposefully focuses on clusters of sponsors to permit analysis of common patterns and variations among them. Those sponsors included in the study are receiving about a tenth of all the allocations made under the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects and the Youth Employment and Training Program. Two are receiving Youth Incentive Entitlement grants for saturation projects, and one is receiving an Entitlement grant for a more limited test. The sample includes 4 balance of state prime sponsorships, several consortia, and rural, suburban and urban sponsors. The prime sponsors reflect a mix of social and economic conditions as well. Adult unemployment rates for the areas range from less than 4 percent to more than 12 percent. Youth rates range from about 11 percent to more than 60 percent. Racial mix in the areas runs from less than 3 percent minority population to more than 50 percent.

"Improving Job Opportunities for Youth" is an overview based on the 10 case studies that were prepared for the Council's second report to the Department of Labor. It identifies some of the major themes running through the individual case studies, and also presents an analysis of the diversity of experiences reflected in them. It does not pretend to capture the wealth of information and details in the individual case studies.

"Improving Job Opportunities for Youth" is divided into three principal parts. The first, "Summary and Recommendations," draws some tentative conclusions about the effectiveness of prime sponsors and the Department of Labor in implementing the new youth programs, and offers some guidance for forthcoming operations. The second, "The National Picture," is an introduction that presents the national backdrop to the prime sponsor experience. Conditions at the national level, and policy directives from the national office, naturally, have had an effect, shaping prime sponsor plans and influencing their experiences. The second part attempts to analyze the nature of those impacts. The third section, "Experience at the Local Level," analyzes the patterns that emerge from the case studies with reference to the objectives that were articulated by the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs.

Several persons contributed, directly or indirectly, to the preparation of "Improving Job Opportunities for Youth." The following Field Associates prepared case studies covering the prime sponsors that are listed. Their work forms the basis for this review. The Field Associates also provided guidance in the course of its preparation.

PETER S. BARTH Professor of Economics University of Connecticut	Connecticut	- City of Waterbury Hartford Consortium Connecticut Balance of State
VERNON M. BRIGGS, JR. Professor of Economics University of Texas	Texas	- Coastal Bend Manpower Consortium City and County of El Paso
	New Mexico	- City of Albuquerque and County of Bernalillo
PETER KOBRAK Associate Professor of Political Science Western Michigan University	Michigan	- Grand Rapids Area Kalamazoo County Muskegon Consortium Lansing Tri-County Regional Manpower Consortium City of Detroit
GRETCHEN MACLACHLAN Research Associate Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy Clark College	Georgia	- City of Atlanta Balance of DeKalb County Cobb County Northeast Georgia Area, Georgia Balance of State
PAUL OSTERMAN Assistant Professor of Economics Boston University	Massachusetts	- City of Boston Worcester Consortium Eastern Middlesex Consortium
RANDALL B. RIPLEY Professor of Political Science Ohio State University	Ohio	- Clark County Columbus-Franklin County Consortium Greene County
MYRON ROOMKIN Associate Professor of Industrial Relations Northwestern University	Illinois	- City of Chicago Balance of Cook County Rockford Consortium
R. C. SMITH MDC, Inc.	North Carolina	- City of Charlotte Durham-Orange County Consortium Alamance County North Carolina Balance of State
BONNIE SNEDEKER Osoro and Associates	Washington	- Kitsap County
	Oregon	- Lane County Portland Oregon Balance of State
JOHN WALSH Olympus Research Corporation	California	- City of San Francisco City of Oakland Marin County Santa Clara/San Jose Sonoma County

Rupert Evans, Marcia Freedman, and Phyllis Wallace, members of the Youth Evaluation Project Committee of the National Council on Employment Policy, lent their time and expertise in commenting on early drafts.

Seymour Brandwein and Robert Taggart of the U.S. Department of Labor also provided valuable comments. Nancy Kiefer helped edit and prepare the manuscript. I am indebted to all these persons for their assistance and cooperation in preparing "Improving Job Opportunities for Youth." I assume responsibility for its contents.

Gregory Wurzburg
Project Director
August 1, 1978

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BLS	-	Bureau of Labor Statistics
CBO	-	Community-Based Organization
CETA	-	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
CSA	-	Community Services Administration
DOL	-	Department of Labor
ES	-	Employment Service
ETA	-	Employment and Training Administration
LEA	-	Local Education Agency
NBO	-	Neighborhood-Based Organization
OMB	-	Office of Management and Budget
OYP	-	Office of Youth Programs
SPEDY	-	Summer Program for the Economically Disadvantaged
Voc Ed	-	Vocational Education
YACC	-	Young Adult Conservation Corps
YCCIP	-	Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects
YEDPA	-	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act
YETP	-	Youth Employment and Training Program
YIEPP	-	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project

IMPROVING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH: A REVIEW OF PRIME SPONSOR EXPERIENCE IN IMPLEMENTING THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ACT

Gregory Wurzburg
Executive Director
The National Council on Employment Policy

"Improving Job Opportunities for Youth" is taken from The Unfolding Youth Initiatives: Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. That report consists of case studies, prepared by 10 Field Associates under subcontract to the National Council on Employment Policy, and an overview prepared by Gregory Wurzburg, Project Director for the evaluation.

The Unfolding Youth Initiatives is the second in a series prepared for the National Council on Employment Policy, under contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. The Field Associates and Project Director are encouraged to express their judgments freely. The observations and analysis in that report are their own.

Preparation and dissemination of "Improving Job Opportunities for Youth" was also supported, in part, by an ongoing grant from the Ford Foundation to the National Council on Employment Policy. The observations and analysis, while based on the case study findings, are those of the author.

For readers interested in referring to the individual case studies, a limited number of copies of the full report is available from the Office of Policy, Evaluation and Research in the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. The report code is MEL 78-13.

The National Council on Employment Policy is a private nonprofit organization of academicians who have a special interest and expertise in the area of manpower. The Council is primarily concerned with furthering research on employment and training problems and assessing related policy issues.

This evaluation was reviewed by the Youth Evaluation Committee of the Council, but does not necessarily represent the views of the Committee members or the Council members.

Curtis Aller
San Francisco State University

Bernard E. Anderson, Chairman
University of Pennsylvania

Vernon Briggs
University of Texas

Rupert N. Evans
University of Illinois

Rashi Fein
Harvard University

Marcia Freedman
Columbia University

Charles C. Killingsworth
Michigan State University

Sar A. Levitan, Chairman,
Executive Committee
The George Washington University

Garth L. Mangum
University of Utah

S. M. Miller
Boston University

Marion Pines
Baltimore Metropolitan Manpower
Consortium

Michael Piore
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

R. Thayne Robson
University of Utah

Philip Rutledge
National Institute of Public Management

Phyllis A. Wallace
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Gregory Wurzburg
Executive Director

On Leave:

Eli Ginzberg
National Commission for Manpower Policy

Ernest Green
U.S. Department of Labor

Juanita Kreps
U.S. Department of Commerce

Ray Marshall
U.S. Department of Labor

William J. Spring
The White House

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The experience of prime sponsors so far suggests, on balance a significant record of success in implementing YEDPA and achieving its goals. Local experiences also suggest some measures that might be pursued at the federal and local levels in order to improve performance even more.

(1) Knowledge Development. YEDPA marked a new emphasis on prime sponsor involvement in evaluation, research, and demonstration activities. The stress on creating a new prime sponsor role in these areas naturally brought with it a need for a great deal of guidance. It also brought with it the realization that in the first year accomplishments would be limited. On the positive side, it appears that many prime sponsors did increase evaluation activities. A minority tried out new approaches, directly in response to the call for knowledge development. A handful attempted structured local experiments. It is almost certain that these types of activities were far more prevalent than they would have been in the absence of the emphasis on local knowledge development. These developments may help prepare a base for absorbing the lessons of nationally directed discretionary knowledge development activities. They may also lead to improvements locally.

It is doubtful, however, that local knowledge development activities will substantially improve overall understanding of youth problems and programs. There is uneven capacity among prime sponsors to undertake this function. There continues to be a good deal of confusion about the substance and form that knowledge development should take. The Department of Labor provided too little guidance about how prime sponsors might approach knowledge development. In the face of the ambiguous, open-ended knowledge development requirements, many prime sponsors did very little, or tried only to respond to what local officials thought that DOL officials wanted. Others attempted to set up excessively sophisticated research projects that, by attempting to do too much, probably will accomplish very little.

The Department could remedy this situation by providing more technical assistance, directly to prime sponsors, or indirectly, by facilitating communication among prime sponsors. The Department should also assure that there is some minimum degree of agreement among the regional offices, with respect to what knowledge development is, and what is allowable in the name of knowledge development. Further guidance on knowledge development should encourage a link between what is being labeled as "knowledge development," and other evaluation/monitoring activities.

(2) The site reports suggest that supervision and job enrichment have been given heavy emphasis by CETA prime sponsors; to the extent that these factors affect the impact of work experience, the new youth programs have produced major improvements. YCCIP, which was designed as a well-supervised work experience with limited enrichment, has been linked with other programs to provide more than work experience alone.

Under YCCIP and YETP, prime sponsors are giving much attention to career exploration for youth through actual work experience and through more structured occupational information channels. The accent on placing youth in career-related jobs is proving to be impractical. Some youths have not thought about career plans. Others have either, what might be considered unrealistic plans, or plans for jobs that do not fit in with the youth jobs that are available. The emphasis on career-related jobs is also premature for many youths, in the sense that they have only the vaguest notions about the world of work. Before they can appreciate the differentiating details of different kinds of jobs, they need to understand the common requirements of all jobs.

On the other hand, vocational exploration classes and counseling seem to be more effective mechanisms for providing exposure to different career options. To the extent that career exploration is emphasized, prime sponsors should be encouraged to provide it through counseling and classroom experience. The highest priority in any job development campaign should be on work experience that teaches, at a minimum, basic work habits, and the importance of those habits.

While prime sponsors have increased emphasis on private sector linkages, and while their efforts have had positive effects in few cases, continued emphasis is needed. Prime sponsors should be encouraged, more than they are already, to attempt to establish a strong bond with private sector interests. More practically, they should be encouraged to evaluate job slot development plans with reference to how much of what is learned in a certain job is transferrable to private sector employment.

(3) Prime sponsors have followed the regulations requiring youth membership on youth advisory councils. However, the advisory council appears to be a poor vehicle for increasing youth participation in prime sponsor affairs. The councils themselves are often mere figureheads, and youths on the councils are not participating very much. Some sponsors are experimenting with alternative modes of participation, and are enjoying some degree of success.

Although Departmental guidance on increasing youth participation is not limited to youth advisory councils, there should be more emphasis on prime sponsors experimenting with other forms of participation.

(4) The YEDPA legislation provides prime sponsors with a degree of latitude in choosing who to enroll in youth programs. However, the Employment and Training Administration has gone beyond the legislation in emphasizing targeting on youth most in need. Prime sponsors have responded positively, by consistently aiming services for economically disadvantaged youths. There may be some force of habit in effect, but local pressures for serving those most in need are also persuasive. Enrollments should be monitored to see whether prime sponsors continue to concentrate on serving economically disadvantaged youth. If/when there is a shift in targeting, further monitoring should be undertaken to determine whether there is a reasonable basis for such shifts.

Prime sponsors are seriously underenrolling females in YCCIP projects. It is not clear whether this is due to relatively few females in the YCCIP applicant pool or to discrimination in job placements. In either case, prime sponsors should be encouraged to undertake more outreach activity, so that female enrollments in YCCIP can be raised.

(5) Substitution of YEDPA resources for Title I resources is not proving to be a serious problem. In fact, there has been a remarkable degree of utilization of other services and programs to enrich the youth initiatives. However, substitution of YEDPA resources for non-CETA resources could prove to seriously diminish the impact of the new funds. There is little that can be done, legally, to control that kind of substitution. But where legal recourse is limited, moral suasion might be more effective.

One way to increase the interests of local sponsors and non-CETA institutions in minimizing substitution is to give them a stake in the action. This, unfortunately, is easier said than done. Sponsors are already being encouraged to build links with other agencies and private sector interests. But this should be pushed even more, on the grounds that a broader local base of participation will better assure a broader constituency interested in stretching YEDPA resources to the maximum. It would be naive to assume that a coherent sense of purpose among many players could be developed, or that this alone will prevent substitution. But since the substitution phenomenon is so nebulous and difficult to control at times, more effective solutions may not be feasible.

(6) Community based organizations are thoroughly involved in the youth program delivery matrix. Although performance differentials are hard to detect, the CBOs do broaden the base of local participation. The current provisions giving them special consideration in the selection of program delivery agents, and including them in the planning process should be retained.

(7) YEDPA shows promise for altering institutional roles and relationships at the local level. The role of local schools is central to this effort. In spite of the rushed implementation, CETA-LEA agreements have been negotiated and programs are in place. Even in areas with little history of CETA-LEA cooperation, the separate CETA and LEA communities are talking with one another, and joint efforts are underway. Nevertheless, there are some obvious limitations on how much change the Department of Labor can leverage in LEAs, by using prime sponsors. LEAs are not accustomed to receiving guidance from CETA prime sponsors. Under the best of conditions, prime sponsors can hope to affect local education policy only marginally. In some of the worst cases, LEAs and sponsors do not speak at all.

For these reasons, the Department of Labor should explore alternate channels for affecting education decisionmaking at the local level. Until those other channels for communication are identified and utilized, many schools will fail to meet the needs of youths who could otherwise be served under cooperative arrangements with LEAs and prime sponsors, or even through the LEAs alone.

One of the significant patterns that seems to be emerging is the presence of LEAs where CETA-private sector links exist. It is possible that LEAs may provide the missing piece necessary to complete productive relationships between public sector CETA agencies and private sector employers. The Department of Labor should examine CETA activities that involve private sector ties, to see whether LEAs play an integral role. The Department should also study some of its exemplary CETA-LEA projects to evaluate their private sector links where they exist, and to estimate the feasibility of such links where they do not exist.

THE NATIONAL PICTURE

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act was enacted to serve a number of ambitious goals, including institutional change and sound experimentation. But perhaps the most persuasive reason for passing YEDPA was the interest in reducing unemployment among youth, among minority youth in particular. Once YEDPA became law, there was a strong national pressure for creating a great number of employment and training opportunities over a relatively brief period of time.

Given the scale and complexity of the new youth programs, the pace of YEDPA implementation represents a major accomplishment. Between December 1977 and June 1978, 225,000 employment and training positions have been created for youth under YEDPA; 20,700 under the Young Adult Conservation Corps, 19,200 under the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects, 163,900 under the Youth Employment and Training Programs' formula funded efforts, 17,400 under Youth Conservation and Improvement Projects' regular programs, and an estimated 4,000 with discretionary YETP and YCCIP money. The job creation effort already comes close to equalling in numbers, and will soon exceed the two and one-half year build up of in-school and out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps activities in the 1960s.

This rapid expansion was not achieved without a great deal of stress, particularly for prime sponsors trying to complete the public service employment expansion. The internal complexity of YETP and YCCIP, and the interfaces that they mandate between prime sponsors and other local institutions, exacerbated the inherent difficulties of program implementation. Prime sponsors experienced delays in getting local plans completed and approved. The process of negotiating agreements with local education agencies was frequently a protracted one.

Table 1

End of Month Enrollments for YEDPA
(does not include enrollments in projects funded with YCCIP and YETP discretionary funds)

Month (1978)	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
YETP	18,917	50,014	88,771	122,928	154,635	163,900
YCCIP	1,807	5,569	10,645	12,073	15,251	17,400
YIEPP	INA	INA	8,712	15,566	22,000	19,200
YACC	8,159	9,598	11,409	12,851	16,540	20,700
TOTAL	INA	INA	119,537	163,418	208,426	221,200

Some prime sponsors met the December start up date originally set by the Department of Labor. But although overall program enrollment has lagged by those early ambitious standards, enrollment should be considered good by any other standards. It might be considered ideal, in light of recent shifts in national policy which deemphasize spending on employment and training programs for youth.

Because many prime sponsors did not begin implementation until late winter, end of quarter enrollments recorded on March 31st were low, for YETP especially. They were 69 percent of plan for YCCIP and 53 percent of plan for YETP. But the apparent poor showing is mitigated when the basis for the planned enrollments is considered.

YEDPA was authorized for one year when it was enacted in August, 1977. It was funded initially for $1 billion, as part of President Carter's economic stimulus package. A supplemental appropriation of $500 million was anticipated, and so enrollment projections were based on spending a total of $1.5 billion by the end of fiscal 1978, which could then be maintained in fiscal 1979.

However, in the face of national unemployment edging downwards, prime sponsor delays in implementing YEDPA, and the almost certain extension of the youth programs beyond September, the $500 million supplemental appropriation was never made. But prime sponsors were instructed to retain their enrollment plans, using money saved by slow implementation to build enrollments in the latter part of the year.

In the period from March 31st to April 30th, prime sponsors continued their build-up. By the end of April, they were 71 percent of plan for both YCCIP and YETP. But by then, many prime sponsors were expressing concern over funding beyond September 30, 1978.

Late in the spring, the Department of Labor, reacting to budget revisions for fiscal 1979, reversed its emphasis on pushing prime sponsors to spend all their funds in fiscal 1978. Since then, the Office of Youth Programs has advised the Department of Labor regional offices to revise downward overall prime sponsor spending to 73 percent of the fiscal 1978 allocations. Enrollment targets reflecting this recent development have not been formulated yet. But, although actual enrollments were far short of planned enrollments, prime sponsors reacted quickly. In June, the YCCIP and YETP enrollment increases were less than a fifth of the May increases.

Field work for this interim report was cut off before prime sponsors had reacted to the mandate for a lower spending level. Consequently, the material that follows does not report on the adjustments individual sponsors made. It is impossible to say whether the sudden drop in enrollment growth is due to policy changes or to a natural leveling off process that occurred as prime sponsors approached their targets. In fact, it appears that the impacts of this on-again, off-again approach were probably minimized because enrollments in most prime sponsor areas were below plan. Early pressure was needed to get them to the 73 percent spending level. Certainly, however, the mixed signals have not contributed to

orderly planning. The case studies do report on how particular prime sponsors reacted to earlier DOL directives, and the shape that local activities have taken so far.

EXPERIENCE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

A natural point of interest in evaluating the implementation of any decentralized program is the way in which national policy is filtered and interpreted, and how it finally fleshes out at the local level. For a program such as YEDPA, with complex provisions and diverse objectives, this concern is a central one.

Many observers at both the national and local level, argue that YEDPA represents, in fact, a retrenchment from the original goal of the CETA system: decentralized and decategorized policy formulation and program delivery. Critics see YEDPA as a categorical, special purpose program that preempts the prime sponsor decisionmaking role with respect to youth policy, and erodes their decisionmaking authority with respect to local manpower programming in general.

The harshest criticism, notwithstanding, prime sponsors can still exercise a large degree of discretion as they implement and operate the new youth initiatives. Although many of the YEDPA goals promulgated from the national level are quite specific, prime sponsors have a good deal of latitude in how they approach these goals.

Last August, the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs distributed A Planning Charter for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. In the charter, the Office laid out general principles. They are the goals and priorities that were intended to serve as a guide to national and local policymakers with responsibilities for implementing the new Act.

The principles present convenient reference points for evaluating prime sponsor progress. The case studies analyze prime sponsor experience in terms of the primary areas of concern (some principles were consolidated). They are: knowledge development, the quality of work experience, youth participation, targeting, substitution, coordination of services, the role of community-based organizations, and institutional change.

Knowledge Development

One of the central emphases of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act is on learning: about the nature of youth employment problems, and about the effectiveness of different strategies for dealing with those problems. The hope is that a few years' worth of well-documented experiments will prove a useful investment, yielding more effective programs in the long run.

There is a dual focus to the YEDPA learning exercise, or "knowledge development:" a national focus and a local focus. At the national level, the Office of Youth Programs in the Department of Labor, is supporting a series of demonstration and research projects funded with

discretionary funds. A few prime sponsors have been selected to operate highly structured pilot projects testing the effect of guaranteed jobs on drop-out rates and youth employment behavior. Other demonstration projects are being funded to test the relative effectiveness of different program deliverers, different ways of linking prime sponsors with local schools, and with private sector employers. This is the most comprehensive array of structured demonstration, evaluation and research activities ever undertaken in connection with the development of employment and training policy.

The other aspect of knowledge development activities, of particular interest for the purposes of this report, is the evaluation, research and demonstration work all prime sponsors are expected to carry on in implementing their youth programs. It is hoped that these initiatives will provide CETA operators with immediately relevant lessons on how to deal with youth employment problems in their respective areas. It is also hoped that they will provide a base of experience and expertise that will subsequently be helpful in replicating and applying the lessons learned from national experiments.

The first round of case studies looked at prime sponsor operations through early January. In that first round, it was evident that prime sponsors were confused by the knowledge development mandate since such activities had not been stressed under previous CETA programs. Prime sponsors greeted it with a healthy degree of skepticism, attaching a variety of definitions to the concept, and pursuing it in a number of ways. Some saw "knowledge development" as a new buzz word for describing evaluation work they had been doing all along. Others saw it as dictating experimental programs featuring rigorous research designs. A few prime sponsors did nothing. However, most accepted the call for knowledge development, although somewhat tentatively, and attempted to do something.

Experience Since January

The uncertainty over knowledge development and the shortage of time for implementing knowledge development plans, that the field evaluators found in the planning and early implementation stage, has carried through into the early months of operation. A shortage of time forced prime sponsors to give short shrift to all but the most necessary considerations. The lack of guidance caused some local administrators to delay action even more, as they tried to get further clarification from regional offices. As a result of all the start-up pressures and initial confusion, the prospects for getting useful intelligence out of this round of programs are not very good. There are methodological inadequacies and, more importantly, competing priorities that may limit the investment in knowledge development projects and limit the impact of the initiatives.

It appears that, at a minimum, prime sponsors welcome what they see to be a new emphasis on quality, and want to give more attention to the effect of what they are doing. The effort has increased attention to qualitative issues and shows signs of opening the door to greater

innovation. But there is still the proverbial gulf between hopes and reality. The actual steps that prime sponsors are taking to implement knowledge development strategies are still uncertain. Most have responded with some isolated plans; a few are implementing comprehensive strategies. But the overall tendency has been to respond to what local administrators think DOL wants to hear. Prime sponsors have become accustomed to careful directions from Washington, and many did not know how to handle the opportunity for local creativity. Few plans reflect a real concern at the local level for looking at the impact of the programs because the process of implementation has required too much attention on the front end. However, much more is being done in the knowledge development area, than would have been done in the absence of the mandate. Many prime sponsors appear to be closer to recognizing the usefulness of knowledge development for their own purposes. Once that hurdle is crossed, there may be some substantive progress towards developing local research and evaluation capabilities.

Knowledge development activities fall into three issue areas: program management, program components, and program impact. Two prime sponsors have knowledge development activities geared to improving program management. Portland is introducing a performance contracting system in which contractors must establish performance goals. This is hoped to improve the prime sponsor's managerial control over contractors, and provide information that can be used in the planning process. Chicago is expected to continue its established practice of feeding evaluation information on program performance into the planning process. It is not clear in the case of either Chicago or Portland that the net impact of the YEDPA emphasis on knowledge development is appreciable. Portland had already given high priority to establishing accountability goals before YEDPA. The youth legislation did, however, provide the nudge to get things moving, with a mandate and money. Chicago's process of feeding evaluation results into planning is nothing new. But it does mean that where youth research and evaluation work bears fruit, there will be a channel available for incorporating those findings into policy.

The frequent response to the knowledge development mandate has been to look at a number of "process" issues. Prime sponsors are laying out designs for examining the feasibility of several innovative program components. The Muskegon Opportunities Industrialization Center, a Muskegon community-based organization, is testing the abilities of enrollees and attempting to place exceptional youths directly in unsubsidized employment, instead of placing them in regular program activities. Kitsap County is hoping to assess the effect on work quality that individualized learning plans and closer cooperation with employers may have. The Muskegon prime sponsor is trying to find out how well paraprofessionals can substitute for professionals as counselors and job coaches. DeKalb County is trying to find ways of reducing drop-out rates and improving placements for a clerical training program. The Connecticut Balance of State prime sponsor tried to test a cash incentive system for reducing absenteeism and turnover among enrollees in one program. However, the DOL regional office rejected the idea. Now, the main thrust of the balance of their knowledge development work, like Waterbury's, is to monitor performance through the existing management information system.

Prime sponsors are aggressively pushing fairly sophisticated impact studies. They are attempting to utilize pre-program and post-program observations of experimental groups and control groups, frequently relying on outside consultants to provide technical assistance, or to actually manage these projects. In Lane County, the University of Oregon is under contract to run a project pairing mentally retarded and non-retarded youth in a work experience situation. The Oregon Balance of State prime sponsor is conducting a mixed income test to see whether income eligible and income non-eligible youth (permitted under the YETP 10 percent set-aside) benefit to different degrees from the same program. The Coastal Bend Consortium is comparing the work performance and academic achievements of economically disadvantaged youth to that of non-disadvantaged youth. Sonoma, sponsoring one of the most sophisticated projects, is analyzing five local firms to see what overtime work could be converted to entry level slots for youth, and to assess the cost of that conversion. If overtime work can be converted to new jobs on a practical basis, and if local workers can be persuaded to forego some overtime, the prime sponsor hopes to establish a job creation program underwriting conversion costs to local firms. Lansing wants to analyze the difference between the effectiveness of traditional work experience and the YCCIP project approach. Evaluators there want to examine placements into unsubsidized employment, the kind of jobs youths go into, retention in those jobs, wages, and the effect on in-school attendance. Under YETP they are taking advantage of the mixed income option.

Rockford has the most comprehensive knowledge development activity, consisting of a research design that embraces all YEDPA activities and participants. To plan for knowledge development, administrators brought in a planning team and hired a consultant. Together they assembled a manual, describing the sponsor's knowledge development goals in detail. It is used for instructing all program operators on how they are to incorporate their activities into the overall scheme. The attitude of the youth program director there is not to set arbitrary performance targets, but, rather, to closely monitor performance and diagnose the mechanics of successes and failures. All the programs are seen to be experimental. On a more modest level, Grand Rapids, Lansing and Muskegon will be administering questionnaires as youths complete the programs. The questionnaires are intended to measure attitudinal and behavioral changes in the program participants.

The widespread interest in undertaking knowledge development work belies the faulty design associated with many of the projects, the obstacles that prime sponsors are encountering, and the misgivings that many have about the concept of knowledge development. For instance, the Lane County project pairing retarded and non-retarded youth was originally designed as an experiment that would include youths above the income cut-off. But the regional office rejected the proposal because it did not meet DOL-established guidelines. The project is now of questionable value because the prime sponsor cannot locate enough income eligible youths who are retarded. The Oregon Balance of State sponsor did manage to win approval for a mixed income project. However, prime sponsor administrators admit that whatever the findings are, they will be of only

limited utility, because the sponsor is testing variables over which administrators have little control. However, the project is expected to be useful in testing the feasibility of performing impact studies in the highly decentralized balance of state operations.

Many local evaluators, slavishly devoted to the formalities of rigorous social experimentation, are frequently testing, what may be inappropriate hypotheses. When, or if answers are forthcoming, they may not be useable in formulating policy. Even if they are useable, it is not clear that the answers are valid and reliable. Control groups are frequently being set up with, what appears to be, too little concern for comparability. Experimental groups, especially for the mixed income projects, are too small to yield statistically significant results. Frequently, the value of using pre-tests and post-tests, is washed out when evaluators give too little attention to how trustworthy instruments like test scores or enrollee records may be.

Prime sponsor interest is necessary, but it is not sufficient for getting knowledge development activities off the ground. Local evaluators have encountered obstacles blocking their way. The most pervasive is simply a lack of resources to devote to knowledge development. Confronted with the choice between maximum services now, or less service now in return for the presumably better service later, the pressure of local interest groups for maximum services is nearly irresistible. This was well-documented in the planning phase, and is still in evidence. Other factors stand in the way, too. In Durham-Orange, local administrators were not able to implement a sophisticated experiment using a control group and experimental group to test the effect of work experience on drop-out rates and school achievement. Program operation has taken too much time, and administrators decided the design was too sophisticated for them. In Chicago, the manpower agency has a computerized management information system which could be used for analyzing data that the prime sponsor has been recording from past programs, and is being used to record data from YEDPA. But there is a great deal of uncertainty now, about which variables ought to be measured and recorded. In spite of their extensive records and in spite of the presence of an evaluation office, administrators still feel the need for some outside assistance on evaluation design. In Atlanta, despite the ready availability of employment service records and YCCIP and YETP data, little analysis is expected because of time pressures. The Grand Rapids Public Schools, involved extensively with the consortium's efforts under YEDPA, will also have extensive youth data in its automated information system; but because of higher priorities within the school systems, the data analysis projects may be bumped. Early plans in Hartford called for using YCCIP allocations in a program to test the effectiveness of a labor intensive project awarding academic credit in encouraging youths to return to school. When school credit could not be arranged, the project was dropped.

Prime sponsors did not take kindly to knowledge development when the concept was first presented. Now that they are making an effort to do something with it, they still have misgivings. In San Francisco, evaluators recalled the lessons of the early 1960s when they found how hard it was to

link research and action programs. The youth director in Oakland, a former demonstration project director, and the Marin County program administrator both questioned the wisdom of "using politically vulnerable CETA prime sponsors as research agents." (John Walsh, Page J-7). The deputy director of the Atlanta CETA office questioned whether the counteryclical objectives of YEDPA and the knowledge development mandate were compatible. He argued that "fewer approaches and greater investment per slot would have permitted more informed knowledge development ...." (Gretchen Maclachlan, Page D-2). But such a strategy would undermine the job creation impact of the youth initiatives.

Knowledge development continues to pose problems for many prime sponsors, and apparently for some regional offices. There has been confusion stemming, in part, from the lack of clear directions, but also from the non-traditional emphasis on local experimentation and evaluation. The lack of time has been a critical impediment to careful planning.

In most of the prime sponsorships, however, the mandate is producing some sincere attempts at discovering what really works in serving youths. There is a healthy diversity in the plans. It is apparent that most of them are not prepackaged exercises, and do reflect local initiative. However, because of the difficulties associated with the first year's experience, many knowledge development projects will fall short of achieving the ambitious goals that certain sponsors have set. It will be important, therefore, to monitor the local response in the second year of YEDPA, to see whether evaluators throw in the towel, or try to reshape their plans, better adapting them to serving their own needs and adopting more realistic goals.

The Quality of Work Experience Under YEDPA

One of the acknowledged shortcomings of past youth programs has been the low quality of work experience. Poor supervision, unstructured work assignments, and nonaccountability have contributed to youth jobs that have left program enrollees no more skilled, and no wiser to the world of work than when they started. The jobs were frequently nothing more than make-work and income transfer programs.

Sponsors of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act recognized some of the shortcomings of earlier youth programs. The Act puts a strong accent on correcting past faults and creating employment and training programs for young adults that contribute in significant and positive ways to their development. The Act states specifically that its purpose is "... to provide youth ... with opportunities to learn and earn that will lead to employment opportunities after they completed the program."

The Department of Labor, in trying to carry through on that mandate, has promulgated regulations and technical assistance documents to steer prime sponsors towards providing adequate supervision, towards monitoring program activities and worksites, and towards making every effort to place youths in jobs related to their career interests.

As the programs have fleshed out, prime sponsors have debated the issue of what makes a quality job, or what makes a quality employment and training experience. Different formulas have evolved in the course of these debates. Some common ingredients persist, though. They consistently come up as considerations in any judgments about work values. One is the attitude that prime sponsors have towards job quality. Another is the nature of auxillary services for work experience enrollees.

Prime sponsors are giving special attention to job quality, and are trying a variety of mechanisms for achieving it, and assuring that an emphasis is kept focused on it. These include placing a greater stress on providing adequate supervision, documenting competencies and providing academic credit. These approaches appear to be having mixed impacts on the jobs. Some of them are also proving to be difficult tactics to adopt. Sponsors are also making consistent efforts to provide career exploration, guidance, and other support services off the job sites.

In the final analysis, the youth participants are the key reference point in analyzing job quality. Observations made from that perspective indicate that some rethinking on this crucial matter may be in order, both to redefine what is meant by "quality" jobs, and to reexplore approaches to assuring quality jobs.

The Prime Sponsor Emphasis on Quality

The starting point in implementing a national jobs and training program for youth, was to instill in prime sponsors the emphasis on quality. That simple stress appears to have been lacking before, or at least suffered low priority treatment at the prime sponsor level. This conclusion is based on the reception given the mandate for quality. One researcher noted "... that prime sponsors are not only aware that YEDPA emphasizes improvements in job quality, but they are also highly supportive of the focus on quality job creation." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-3). Another evaluation identified the spirit of a "new effort" in the YEDPA programs. /emphasis added/ (R. C. Smith, Page H-3).

Prime sponsors, adopting the emphasis on quality, are transmitting the message in a variety of ways. Many of them have gotten the message through to the contractors that "YETP and YCCIP are programs intended to provide youth with work experience, where relevant to program activities, for the purpose of career development and enhancement rather than simply with glorified income maintenance." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-12). The countercyclical goal of fast job creation has been sooner sacrificed, than the goal of creating quality jobs. Although it is difficult to define or measure the quality of the jobs which have resulted, there has been no lack of effort in improving quality. For a YCCIP program in Hartford, CETA professionals are auditing worksites to see that training is being done. Enrollees are being tested for skill development. The Greene County CETA staff visited the Employment Service to locate good supervisors; the Employment Service, in a spirit of cooperation, is providing the supervisors

with training. Sonoma, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Oakland, and Marin County are all carefully monitoring worksites, observing work, and interviewing enrollees and supervisors alike.

A constant eye over the shoulder may guarantee that there is a concern for quality, but it takes specific program features to translate the concern into actual results. One of the characteristic approaches to achieving program quality is by providing complete packages of services to youths. In a number of prime sponsorships, this has been marked by a shift away from traditional work experience. In-school youth are receiving a broad range of career development experiences that augment selected work experiences. Both Lane County and Portland's YETP programs have less than 15 percent of their actual enrollments in work experience. Portland puts out-of-schoolers into work experience, but only as a provisional measure. The principal emphasis is on obtaining some kind of high school certification. Continued work experience is contingent upon enrollment and attendance in a GED or equivalent program.

Prime sponsors in Michigan have shown a similar awareness of the larger purposes of work experience in YETP and YCCIP. Under YETP, local sponsors are complementing work experience with job information, counseling and placement services, to ease the youths' transition to the workforce.

One of the more surprising developments has been the widespread supplementation of YCCIP jobs with a variety of non-work services. In spite of the small 5 percent limit on overhead (that discouraged many potential program deliverers from even applying for projects), work experience is being augmented with a variety of services. In Detroit, Wayne State University runs a YCCIP project in which it is providing basic training to raise the educational level of program participants. Half the enrollees in a YCCIP rehabilitation project are enrolled in a GED program or continuing education program. Although they do not receive academic credit for work, they are being paid while they attend class.

One exceptional YCCIP project in Sonoma has youths working four days a week and attending class one day a week. The work is described as manual labor. The classes are in agriculture and maintenance work. Enrollees are receiving three units of work experience and five units of academic credit from a local junior college. The project, originally aiming to place one-half its participants in unsubsidized employment by September, has exceeded its target. Fully 60 percent of the original participants have left their minimum wage slots and found unsubsidized jobs.

Another YCCIP project, also in Sonoma, places enrollees in a seven month program of work experience and education. Youths spend about 32 hours a week caring for community gardens, pruning trees, installing sprinkler systems, landscaping, setting flower beds, and doing maintenance. The rest of the time is spent in horticulture, gardening, and landscaping classes sponsored by the County schools. Here too, the work pays minimum wage. Although some enrollees have said they could find higher paying jobs elsewhere, they are staying for the training and certificate that will be awarded upon completion.

Several Michigan prime sponsors are augmenting YCCIP experience with "employability" training and vocational training. One of the Oregon Balance of State projects had YCCIP supervisors trained in counseling so that they could provide more support to enrollees on the job, as well as some skill training adapted to enrollee needs.

A Boston YCCIP landscaping project is offering a range of supportive services that center around building self-esteem and improving attitudes. Classroom training is also provided. Another YCCIP project in Worcester, enrolling drop-outs with acute skill shortages and social adjustment problems, starts each day with classroom training in a local adult learning center. The cash income for participating in the YCCIP auxillary services is a feature, however, that may mask the true degree of interest that youths have in those services. El Paso runs a YCCIP project for in-school youth only with classes that involve career exploration and self-awareness. Enrollees there are not paid for class time. In its first month of operation, the El Paso project experienced a 10 percent decline in enrollment.

The services and support being provided for YCCIP participants are above and beyond the requirements of YEDPA. However, prime sponsors see an acute need for something more than work. They see the legislation as being restrictive, discouraging services to a class of participants -- mostly economically disadvantaged school-leavers -- who need them the most. Virtually all of the prime sponsors are targeting most, if not all (see Table 2, Page 27), their YCCIP slots to economically disadvantaged youths, who are acutely in need of more than just an income and work that may have some transferrable skills to later employment. Some participants in a maintenance project, for example, could not read tape measures. High quality work experience will not benefit them if it is offered without some opportunity for basic education.

Many prime sponsors are offering YCCIP enrollees the extra training or education opportunities they need to ensure that participation really will improve long-term prospects for employment. But it is a constant struggle requiring first of all, a will to do more than the legislation requires, and a considerable amount of resource juggling. In the words of one counselor, "/w/e just don't have the flexibility or range of options with the YCCIP projects that we do under YETP or Title I ... it's just a one-shot deal. Sure we can give a dropout a job, but I'm not sure whether these kids are any better off when the project's over." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-5).

The award of academic credit for work experience has been seen as a mechanism sweetening the incentives for participants to work, and forcing educators and manpower administrators to pay more attention to job quality. Where academic credit is being awarded, these two objectives are being met with varying degrees of success. Where academic credit is not being awarded, there is good evidence of a need for more flexible accomodation between the CETA and LEA establishments.

Academic credit is being awarded this school year in both YCCIP and YETP. Ninety-five in-school YETP enrollees in Charlotte are participating in a vocational training-work experience-academic enrichment program that is

granting one-half elective credit for the spring semester. A full credit will be granted for a year's participation (13 credits are required for graduation). YETP in-school and out-of-school participants in Sonoma, San Francisco, Marin, and Santa Clara are receiving academic credit for their work experience. A YCCIP project run by public schools in the Lansing Consortium is offering academic credit for work performed in conjunction with a high school ecology course. Nearly all YETP enrollees in the Washington-Oregon case study are receiving academic credit this year for work experience. Next year, officials in some programs are hoping to be able to petition successfully for credit in academic areas.

Most program enrollees, however, are not yet receiving academic credit for their work. The reasons vary. In some cases, programs started too late for arrangements to be made. In North Carolina, state regulations governing the award of academic credit are stringent. Although it can be done, as the Charlotte prime sponsor demonstrated, arranging credit for work experience will take more time than sponsors had in the rush for implementation. The Springfield schools in Clark County are moving very cautiously in awarding academic credit for work. They want to do it, but they also want to be sure that any arrangements will stand up to the scrutiny of the board of education, the state education department and regional accreditation associations. In Columbus, prime sponsor administrators are not sure who should arrange academic credit or how it should be done. Greene County, a third prime sponsor in Ohio, has actually contacted state level educators. As was the case with Clark County, program officials have received little useful guidance. However, Greene County observers infer that state educators view YEDPA and the manpower community with some suspicion, and that getting the blessings of state educators from accredited work experience, will take more effort. A Connecticut Balance of State contractor serving out-of-school youth has not attempted to secure academic credit because there is so little concern for it among the enrollees. The Grand Rapids prime has not succeeded in getting academic credit awarded for this year's projects. But in mid-April, it laid down a requirement that all YCCIP and YETP contractors develop a plan and schedule for reaching agreements with LEAs by June 30th.

Although inertia, red tape, and timing problems have all undermined some of the efforts to get academic credit for work experience, there is also affirmative resistance to the notion. Some of the resistance can be traced to skepticism about whether work experience can be treated as a legitimate learning experience. LEA officials in North Carolina have stipulated that credit will be awarded only for strictly supervised work experience that involves formal training, is related to a participant's vocational track, and permits academic supervision. In the Connecticut Balance of State prime sponsorship, academic credit is not being awarded for some projects which provide training considered below the par of what might be expected as part of a high school course.

Resistance to awarding academic credit is also based more on what might be described as matters of principle. In Grand Rapids a school official said that students already receive academic credit for such a great number of activities that educators have problems keeping them in

school long enough to meet their basic educational needs." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-17). Detroit school officials echoed the sentiments, stating in their YETP application that paid work experience would be incentive enough for enrollee participation and success. A Durham-Orange school principal suggested that the best way drop-outs could secure academic credit would be by returning to school.

The second year of operation for the YETP and YCCIP activities ought to see more cases of academic credit being awarded for work experience. Prime sponsors and LEAs alike are pursuing the matter. With the benefit of more planning time, they should succeed. However, no matter how much time there is for making arrangements, there will probably be some areas where resistance does not break down. It remains to be seen whether the absence of academic credit will be decisive in determining program success or failure in those few areas. It is clear, however, that, on the whole, the emphasis on gaining academic credit was taken seriously by prime sponsors. Arrangements for credit have been far more prevalent than under earlier CETA activities, and some of them appear to be sound models for future efforts.

Supervision and Work Quality

Many of the past youth programs have been plagued with poor on-site supervision for young workers. Supervisors have been insensitive to the needs -- and ignorance -- of young workers making their first contact with the world of work. Supervisors were frequently ill-equipped to provide any significant skill training and, in some cases, supervisors did not enforce even minimal rules of work -- showing up at work on time, or working a full day, for example. The problems have been attributable to a number of factors. Historically, supervision has been considered as an afterthought. Little allowance was made for the costs of providing supervision for extra youth workers added on to existing workforces. Little thought was given to the special demands of supervising youths, as new entrants to the labor force.

Responding to these shortcomings, YEDPA has put a premium on quality supervision, and provided some resources to encourage it. As is the case of the overall emphasis on quality, prime sponsors welcome the accent, and have responded in many different ways.

Prime sponsors are trying first to find qualified supervisors, or, lacking that, to train them. An Oregon Balance of State operator delayed start up on a solar heating project until some competent, income-eligible Title VI supervisors could be found and trained in counseling techniques. The Muskegon Consortium is requiring special training for all youth supervisors next year. A Kitsap County YCCIP project reduced youth work schedules to thirty hours per week so that there would be enough money to pay qualified supervisors.

Prime sponsors are also making an effort to maintain good supervisory quality by monitoring worksites. In Muskegon, the work experience contractors are providing on-site supervision. Each contractor is also providing a roving supervisor to tackle problems that on-site supervisors are not able to handle. Kitsap County is encouraging better supervision by using competency-based learning plans on the worksites. They have had the effect of forcing supervisors to pay more attention to the work youths are doing, and focusing job duties on training objectives. The Kitsap prime sponsor staff also carries on a rigorous monitoring schedule and maintains close contact with supervisors.

Supervisor loads vary to some extent, between YETP and YCCIP activities. Because of this, simple supervisor/worker ratios do not reflect the real quality of supervision. YCCIP activities usually center around projects that cannot be integrated with work already being done. Because tasks are usually similar, if not identical, YCCIP sites frequently lend themselves to a team approach, utilizing somewhat lower supervisor/worker ratios, than YETP projects. But these ratios have in no way hindered the quality of work or the value of the experience for enrollees. One YCCIP project in Charlotte consisted of a supervisor and team of nine youths working on housing rehabilitation. The supervisor, a construction engineer with experience as a superintendent, was sensitive to the needs of the participants and had developed an esprit de corps. Another project that puts lower income youth with criminal records to work weeding, eliminating fire hazards, and cleaning ditches has two supervisors for a crew of fourteen enrollees. The project has been extraordinarily successful. Another project with a supervisor for every four or six enrollees has not been nearly as successful in retaining enrollees. The smaller teams in that project may mean less peer interaction. But the project also suffers from oversell. The jobs, although no more menial than other YCCIP projects, were sold to the trainees as being more glamorous than they really are.

The YETP programs present a different situation. Youths are frequently integrated with ongoing workforces. While the number of YETP participants assigned a supervisor is frequently low -- one to three -- the quality of supervision does not appear to be as good. Existing staff with little supervisor experience is often used. Employers have occasionally assigned youths to supervisors who have been unwilling and sometimes unqualified. Even where the number of YETP participants added to a worksite is small, the reported ratios do not reflect the real supervisory workload. Supervisors also are responsible for regular employees, diminishing the attention available for a youth worker.

Whatever the relative edge of YCCIP project supervision may be over YETP supervision, supervision under both programs seems to be good. Some local observers think the supervision in YEDPA programs is superior to earlier youth work experience projects. Youths have appreciated the emphasis on quality supervision, and supervisors have found youths to adjust well to the demands of the job.

Obstacles to Quality Jobs

In their attempts to develop quality jobs for youth, prime sponsors have found themselves stymied at times. The early rush to develop a large quantity of slots made it difficult for local officials to develop quality slots. A Grand Rapids administrator bemoaned the federally-imposed quantitative and qualitative standards. A planner in Lansing Consortium complained about the lack of detail that employing agencies provided in their position descriptions, and the plantation mentality behind employing agencies accepting work experience candidates without ever knowing precisely where the youths could work best and gain the most.

The emphasis on public sector and private non-profit sector employment is cited as another barrier to creating "meaningful" jobs that would leave youths with genuinely marketable skills. Sponsors agree that most employment opportunities are in the private sector. The career interests of most youths center around the kinds of jobs found chiefly in the private sector. Yet regulations and the presumptive role of government agencies and community based organizations serve to effectively restrict all but a few youth jobs to public service work experience. "The challenge ... has been to find jobs in non-profit agencies suited to the vocational preferences of the participants -- 'it's not easy to find auto mechanic jobs in the YMCA,' one counselor noted." (R. C. Smith, Page H-6).

The last criticism is the most serious. It is one that extra time will not eliminate. It is not clear that prime sponsors would have the access to private sector opportunities, even if YEDPA permitted it; but the comments of program administrators seem to imply a willingness to attempt some private sector job development.

Career Aspirations for Youth

One of the mandates of YEDPA -- stressed repeatedly in the legislation and by the Department of Labor -- is the importance of "meaningful" jobs. One of the criteria of a "meaningful" job has been the relevance of work experience to the career aspirations of youths.

The legislative history of YEDPA, the law itself, and promulgations from the Department of Labor are sprinkled with references to the importance of linking the career goals of youths, with their work experience under YEDPA. The rationale has been two-fold: give young adults a taste of the career areas in which they are interested, and provide them with job-specific experience and skills they can take with them.

The emphasis, while a logical and appropriate one in some cases, has its drawbacks. It is based squarely on the assumption that youths have a clear idea of what their career goals are, and that the knowledge is a solid basis for action in arranging job assignments.

In fact, many youths have not given a great deal of thought to what they want to do for a living. YEDPA jobs are the first jobs for an enormous number of enrollees. Many of those who are thinking ahead, do not have realistic expectations about what they would like to do, and do not have clear ideas of how they should go about doing what they want to do. In these cases, some of the programs are proving to be effective eye openers. But prime sponsors remain skeptical as to how realistic some of the more ambitious goals may be. Counselors and CETA staff alike indicate that many youths take the YCCIP and YETP jobs just for the money, and not because the jobs fit into career plans. For the youths who do have career plans, many are plainly unrealistic, or the youths do not have a good sense for what is required to achieve them. One youth hoping to start college soon was reading at a second grade level. Another, a sophomore working in an animal hospital, had no idea what he wanted to do. Many have separated the job at hand from career aspirations. One aspiring trumpet player wanted more hours at his "janitor helper" job; not because it was career relevant, but because he needed money. Another seventeen year old employed picking up paper and cleaning washrooms in a park, wants to be a registered nurse or a model. She presumably values the job for the money, and the money alone. As she put it, "I think that if I had YETP program I would keep theory out because it don't make sense." (sic) (Myron Roomkin, Page G-11). An eighteen year old who wants to be a basketball palyer works as a custodian aid in parks. The program does not do much for his basketball game, but he thinks it is great because it provides him with money, and keeps him off the street and out of trouble.

Some of the youths are not so specific about their career plans. When some participants in Georgia were questioned about future plans, they were fairly vague, indicating where they wanted to live and whether they wanted to go to college. Some indicated they wanted to take up trades, but they were not sure which ones.

Although many students going into the programs do not have clear career plans, they do attach some value to the work experience. For the few with some specific ideas, the programs may be succeeding in gelling their thoughts. For one student who had worked in several jobs, her YETP work experience as a tutor has inspired her to become a teacher. The young adults in a Sonoma landscaping project pass up the opportunities for higher paying jobs just so they can get certified training and experience in their YCCIP project.

Few people seriously presume that a 16 year old youth has mapped out hard and fast career plans. For that reason, some prime sponsors are not giving a great deal of attention to matching jobs with the career interests of enrollees. However, the changeability of career plans does encourage prime sponsors to give considerable attention to career exploration activities so that youths are, in fact, exposed to valid information and can formulate some realistic career goals. Although participants may come into the programs with nothing more than an interest in money, sponsors are providing auxillary services to assure that they leave with more than that. "The counselors see <u>their</u> jobs as helping to

turn the kids away from an immediate focus and on to career development." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page H-7).

There seems to be a widespread feeling among prime sponsors that youths have not given much serious thought to career plans. Because of that, many youths apparently are not attaching a great significance to their work. But, the strategy that is emerging, is one of using work experience together with vocational exploration programs, as a vehicle for starting youths in the process of thinking about long-term career plans. The cases like the DeKalb County girl who, before her job, "... didn't know accounting could be so much fun," (Gretchen Maclachlan, Page D-11), but has now decided to take up accounting in college, are icing on the cake.

Youth Participation

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act tries to carry national youth employment and training policies one step further than in the past, by expanding the youth role beyond that of mere participant. The only binding requirements on prime sponsors to assure representation of the youth perspective are a legislative requirement mandating the establishment of youth councils and DOL regulations requiring youth membership on the councils. But in the vein of other federal efforts that now encourage target group participation, YEDPA is encouraging direct youth involvement in aspects of program operation and evaluation.

Prime sponsors have responded to the letter of the law. Of course, it is too early to make final judgments about the effects of the new youth role -- the adjustments require time for both the youths and the adults on the councils. But so far, the accomplishments have been mixed. In a few cases, the effect of youth involvement on planning councils has been significant; but usually, it is not. The youths themselves frequently do not participate. Where they do, the participation is more form than substance. Another serious impediment to a substantive youth role, is the limited policy impact of the councils themselves. They are frequently not the forums for real policymaking decisions.

In light of the limited utility of youth representation on the council, some prime sponsors, responding to the spirit of the law, are trying alternative channels for bringing youth into the mainstream of decisionmaking. Some of these alternative approaches to gaining youth input show ingenuity, and promise to enhance the chance for substantive contributions.

Selecting Youth as Members on the Youth Advisory Councils

Prime sponsors are using one of two methods for selecting youth members for their youth advisory councils. They either select youths who are representative of the target population, or they select youths displaying

leadership qualities that set them above the norm. In the latter case some primes choose only YETP or YCCIP participants while others are being less restrictive.

The method of selection seems to be a necessary, but not sufficient condition for determining the roles that youths play. Where youths have been selected strictly because they are representative of program participants, they are proving to be ineffective. Many of them are shy and withdrawn, intimidated by the adults and overwhelmed by the complexity of matters before the council. If they are not uninterested, they are typically passive. In Charlotte, youth members are rarely in attendance and are having a difficult time communicating with the adult members of the council, most of whom are professionals. The San Francisco youth council, which is three-fourths youth (drawn from youth programs in the area) has a difficult time assembling a quorum for its meetings because of absenteeism.

Random selection of youth members has not achieved any degree of useful youth input. Handpicking participants is producing better results, but is no guarantee that youth members will be active. Alamance County CETA officials and school administrators carefully selected the youth members. But the youths all lost interest and either dropped out or otherwise became inactive. On the second round, the prime sponsor decided to elicit volunteers. The response was good and the prime sponsor picked those appearing most capable and interested. Alamance County stands, now, as one of the more successful examples of youth participation.

Kitsap County and Atlanta have both found articulate and hard-working youth members. They are active in their own right, and the Kitsap County standout, although not a program enrollee, is actively encouraging a larger voice for participants in finding out which programs work and why.

Chicago, Cook County and Rockford tried a variety of approaches to pick outstanding program participants for council membership. Although attendance is good, none is experiencing any notable success with its youth representatives. Kalamazoo extended invitations to youths who were recommended by the main program contractor. Attendance is poor. Muskegon based its selection on recommendations from school principals, student governments, and council members. The youth do make some comments, but contributions are not considered to be appreciable. Lansing, on the other hand, having selected one youth from each of its out-of-school and in-school programs, is having some degree of success. Attendance is good, but it is not clear what substantive contributions are being made.

Interest in Achieving Genuine Youth Participation

Virtually no prime sponsor considers the youth councils to be the best way to achieve youth participation. But, the sponsors who consider youth involvement to be an important goal are inclined to explore alternative

modes of involvement, rather than spending much effort on improving council activities.

In the Portland prime sponsorship, where youth members of the council are not active, counselors and area managers are taking the time to talk with the participants. The views are then being channeled back to program planners who are incorporating some of the ideas into the decisionmaking process.

When the first crop of youth members stopped participating in the Alamance youth council, administrators tried a different selection process that produced a more interested group. But, the prime sponsor is also allowing a broader kind of participation for youths. Instead of just reviewing program plans, they are also involved in participant counseling and problem-solving.

The prime sponsors in Michigan are notable for the consensus evident there, that youth membership in advisory councils is not likely to have much impact on final decisions. "None of the prime sponsors are relying with any conviction on youth to play a major role ... as envisioned by some of YEDPA's congressional sponsors. The knowledge required to follow such policy discussions appears to be simply beyond the grasp of these young people regardless of their relationship to CETA and YEDPA." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-22). The councils are seen as poor forums for youth involvement. The prime sponsors there, however, are exploring alternative approaches to youth participation. The key to the alternative approaches to seeking the youth perspective "... is their emphasis on obtaining feedback from youth rather than opinions on what the overall program should or should not be. The latter assumes a policy orientation and an ability to conceptualize abstractly that seem almost the antithesis of what one could legitimately expect most youth -- no less disadvantaged youth -- to bring to decision making sessions." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-23).

Other important adaptations are being made outside the councils. The Grand Rapids public schools are setting up grievance committees to hear participant complaints. The prime sponsor will be questioning participants to get their views on program quality and impact. Contractors for the other three prime sponsors intend to conduct similar surveys. A number of other agencies have already circulated questionnaires to survey youth responses so far and to record their suggestions for program changes. The Lansing Consortium has already incorporated survey results into its 1979 planning process.

The feeling that the councils are of limited usefulness in getting youth views is widespread. "A spokesman for a Cook County LEA emphasized that YETP kids are distinguishable from their age cohort in ways likely to reduce their council participation." (Myron Roomkin, Page G-14). Chicago and Rockford CETA staffers survey youths for their views by pulling them out of the council setting.

Prime sponsors are also broadening opportunities for youth involvement by putting them in integral program roles. Cook County has put young adults to work as youth placement counselors and job developers

in the (successful) Chicago Heights Youth Employment Service. Greene County (Ohio) is thinking about hiring youths as peer counselors. A Connecticut Balance of State YCCIP project employs a YETP participant as a secretary, involved in day-to-day administration of the project.

Skepticism notwithstanding, some of the prime sponsors are still trying to improve the quality of youth participation on the councils. Muskegon is considering a proposal to have representatives from student governments in all the schools, join the council. In Kalamazoo the youth council chairman and the CETA staff director have taken steps to increase the council's input for the FY 1979 youth plans. In an ambitious ground-up program review planning process, the council succeeded in formulating strategies and setting priorities. The final impact remains to be seen.

A Shift in Emphasis?

As a rule, the effect of youth participation on the youth advisory councils is limited. The youth councils, like the full councils, are not particularly effective in their own right. Furthermore, youths do not seem inclined or equipped to participate on the councils to any great extent. But prime sponsors are adopting other modes of involvement that seem eminently more practical, and are geared to getting youth views on what youths know best: the programs that have been established for them.

There is no single model for this improved involvement. But the variety of approaches all seem to be responses to the mandate that prime sponsors encourage an active role for youths in helping to assess programs and steer future policy.

Targeting

YEDPA is a targeted effort aimed specifically at young adults. Within that broad target group, there are some specific sub-targets identified by congressional sponsors and the Department of Labor. YCCIP is aimed at 16-19 year old youths who are out of work. YETP is intended for unemployed and underemployed youths from families whose current gross family income is less than 85 percent of the BLS lower living standard. Up to 10 percent of YETP enrollees can be from families exceeding the income threshold, if they are part of an experimental, mixed income group. Additionally, prime sponsors have been encouraged to identify significant segments of the target population for special attention.

The targeting provisions leave prime sponsors with a fair amount of latitude in selecting youths to serve. The flexibility is intended to permit prime sponsors to better adapt youth programs to the participation needs of each sponsor area. The hope at the national level consistently has been, however, that prime sponsors would serve those youths most in need, that is, those youths with the least chance of finding assistance from other sources.

In considering the issue of how prime sponsors are targeting their services, three topics are most important. (1) the actual breakdown of enrollments, (2) how prime sponsors identify target groups, and (3) how effective the income criteria are.

Enrollment Breakdowns

Data on enrollments are still incomplete for YEDPA. The most recent data available when the case studies were prepared, were for the quarter ending March 31, 1978. Unfortunately, many prime sponsor activities were barely off the ground at that point, and most reflect only partial enrollments. The data available are tabulated in Tables 2 and 3.

Two trends are evident from data available so far. First, prime sponsors are concentrating on serving economically disadvanted youths (youths from families whose income is 70 percent of the BLS lower living standard, or less). This holds for both YETP, with a 85 percent lower living standard threshold, and YCCIP, with no income criteria. The decision to concentrate on this group reflects deliberate decisions in almost all cases to serve youths most in need of the YEDPA services. Prime sponsors also recognize the political risks of widening the focus.

However, two factors militate against prime sponsors focusing exclusively on economically disadvantaged youth. There is an interest in broadening participation, so that youth programs are not stigmatized as a "poverty program." In a few areas, prime sponsors are also having difficulty filling their slots with economically disadvantaged youth. In areas such as Marin County, prime sponsors claim that there are few youths from economically disadvantaged families. However, the incidence of poverty is not necessarily a reliable indicator of how much prime sponsors target for lower income groups. For example, Cobb County, with a lower incidence of poverty than Atlanta, has a higher proportion of extremely poor youths enrolled in its programs.

A second, very predictable targeting pattern (not reported in the available data) is the emphasis on serving in-school youths with YETP and out-of-school youth with YCCIP. There are deviations from this pattern, however. They appear to be more a function of institutional factors than economic factors (youth unemployment, for example). The YCCIP project in Albuquerque is closely tied to the LEA. There, in-schoolers outnumber out-of-schoolers by a ratio of more than five to one. A similar situation exists in Lansing, although the imbalance is not quite so acute.

Identifying Target Groups for Special Attention

There are few surprises to the outreach efforts that prime sponsors make. The Employment Service and the schools are usually used for locating students and enrolling them. As a rule, it appears as though

Table 2

Enrollments by Family Income

	YETP		YCCIP	
	Income as a % of BLS Lower Living Standard		Income as a % of BLS Lower Living Standard	
	<70%	70-85%	<70%	70-85%
California				
Marin				
Oakland				
Santa Clara/San Jose				
San Francisco				
Sonoma				
Connecticut				
BOS	83%	11%	58%	5%
Hartford Consortium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Waterbury		100%(a)	0%	100%
Georgia				
BOS	90%	10%	NA	NA
Atlanta	76%	24%	61%	39%
Cobb County	84%	16%	76%	7%
DeKalb County	75%	25%	NA	NA
Illinois				
Chicago	100%	0%		
Cook County	79%	21%		
Rockford	60%	21%	67%	13%
Massachusetts				
Boston	100%	0%		
Eastern Middlesex	93%	7%	94%	6%
Worcester	93%	7%	93%	7%
Michigan				
Detroit				
Grand Rapids	99%	1%	85%	15%
Kalamazoo County	86%	14%	67%	0%
Lansing Tri-County	84%	9%	68%	NA
Muskegon				
New Mexico				
Albuquerque	100%	0%	100%	
North Carolina				
BOS	88%	12%	64%	36%
Alamance County	88%	12%	96%	6%
Charlotte	85%	15%	94%	6%
Durham-Orange County	96%	4%	90%	10%
Ohio				
Clark County		100%(a)		97%(a)
Columbus-Franklin	93%	7%	83%	17%
Greene County		100%(a)	0%	100%(a)
Oregon				
BOS	68%	23%	100%	0%
Lane County	86%	14%	NA	NA
Portland	91%	9%	85%	15%
Texas				
Coastal Bend	89%	7%	NA	NA
El Paso	78%	22%	100%	0%
Washington				
Kitsap County	100%	0%	NA	NA

(a) At or below the 85% level. No further breakdown available.

Table 3

Enrollments by Sex

	YETP			YCCIP		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
California						
Marin						
Oakland						
Santa Clara/San Jose						
San Francisco						
Sonoma						
Connecticut						
BOS	154	148	302	98	42	140
Hartford Consortium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Waterbury	64	69	133	10	10	20
Georgia						
BOS	144	155	299	9	18	27
Atlanta	319	467	786	70	38	108
Cobb County	36	34	70	26	14	40
DeKalb County	38	62	151			
Illinois						
Chicago	(47%)	(53%)	(a)	(61%)	(39%)	(a)
Cook County	(51%)	(49%)	(a)	(90%)	(10%)	(a)
Rockford	(52%)	(48%)	(a)	(98%)	(2%)	(a)
Massachusetts						
Boston						
Eastern Middlesex						
Worcester						
Michigan						
Detroit						
Grand Rapids	386	355	741	21	6	27
Kalamazoo County	58	43	101	3	3	6
Lansing Tri-County	330	315	645	40	7	47
Muskegon						
New Mexico						
Albuquerque	39	52	91	42	12	54
North Carolina						
BOS	3789	3212	7001	186	36	222
Alamance County	78	91	169	11	7	18
Charlotte	86	164	250	17	1	18
Durham-Orange County	66	81	147	18	3	21
Ohio						
Clark County	108	72	180	22	7	29
Columbus-Franklin	214	227	441	88	11	99
Greene County	2	11	13	5	0	5
Oregon						
BOS	146	119	265	17	4	21
Lane County	17	109	126	18	4	22
Portland	84	129	213	4	9	13
Texas						
Coastal Bend	91	108	199	NA	NA	NA
El Paso	166	214	380	35	0	35
Washington						
Kitsap County	20	31	57	9	4	13

(a) Numerical breakdowns not available.

community based organizations enjoy little discernible edge over the more traditional outreach and enrollment services, in penetrating particular population subgroups.

The extent to which prime sponsors zero in on significant segments of the youth population varies. Some are not identifying any groups for special attention. Others have come up with specific numerical targets. Hartford is reserving 50 percent of its YETP slots for women, 7 percent for handicapped, and 15 percent for persons with limited speaking ability. Clark County is reserving 90 percent of the slots in one particular project for youth offenders. These programs are still getting underway, so those figures may represent just good intentions. But some prime sponsors have actually succeeded in enrolling youths who have been underrepresented in the past. Four percent of the Lansing YETP enrollees are handicapped. In Lane County the figure is 3.3 percent. In Kitsap it is nearly 9 percent. Youth offenders comprise 7 percent of the YETP enrollments in Lansing, and nearly 25 percent in Lane County.

Youths from AFDC families are also frequent targets for special emphasis. In some areas they comprise more than half the YETP and YCCIP enrollees. In Grand Rapids, nearly two out of three of YETP enrollees are members of families receiving AFDC.

Females are still being given short shrift in some areas. Although they are well represented in most YETP programs, they are almost universally underrepresented in YCCIP. Where sex breakdowns were complete, YCCIP projects were typically enrolling fewer than 1 female for every 3 males. Some areas have especially poor records, with females outnumbered more than 5 to 1. The pattern reflects the high incidence of manual labor jobs; jobs which have traditionally excluded women. The high ratio of males to females also reflects the fact that YCCIP is concentrating on the high school dropout population -- a male-dominated group. Breakdowns of the YCCIP applicant pool are not available, however, so this presumption must remain untested.

Verifying Eligibility

Although prime sponsors do have some maneuvering room with respect to income eligibility, they are of course required to check certain minimal requirements and make some effort at validating eligibility data. In fact there are no uniform procedures for doing this. Some prime sponsors rely almost exclusively on the income data provided by the youths themselves. In Atlanta, the income data that youths report directly to intake specialists are accepted without further examination. Cobb County takes a similar approach, corroborating eligibility only for AFDC recipients.

In Chicago and Cook County, contractors operate their own intake services, so control is diffuse and sometimes nonexistent. Representatives of the Chicago Board of Education did not realize they were supposed to verify income eligibility. Their attitude was that it was not their problem.

In some areas, great pains are being taken to use reliable data and to certify it as being valid data. Rockford verifies data with W-2 forms, check stubs and public assistance caseload information. Prime sponsors in California check school records and records on file with agencies such as local employment offices and welfare offices. Grand Rapids uses data such as welfare records, and occasionally resorts to asking parents for tax returns.

With even the tightest screening procedures, though, ineligibles can get through if they try hard enough. As one CBO staffer explained: "It's amazing how many kids have family incomes that are five dollars below the income ceiling." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-32). This is why some prime sponsors are inclined to place a heavy reliance on schools for doing screening; expecially in small towns. "As an intake agent, the LEA probably offers the best control on eligibility compliance, since teachers and counselors are generally aware of students' financial circumstances." (Myron Roomkin, Page G-18).

But the necessity of the income criterion is sometimes questioned as well as the validity. As one CBO planner said: "What parents make is no longer determining what happens to the kids; drugs, crime, alcoholism, and lack of character are increasingly crossing class lines." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-33). A counselor noted "... that the program emphasis on training, career development, and self-help is not exactly geared to the needs of middle class kids looking for easy ways to get extra spending money." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-11). The implication is that there is a degree of self-screening that goes on.

Just as important as the questionable need for strict eligibility determination, is the questionable validity of the data that is collected. It is difficult, expensive and time consuming to verify data. There is also uncertainty about how to handle youths who live alone, head a household, are not claimed as dependents by parents or move from one guardian, foster parent, or family to another.

The income eligibility guidelines can present bothersome hitches in the intake process in some balance of state operations or the sprawling consortia that straddle metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. Coastal Bend encompasses the city of Corpus Christi and twelve rural counties in Texas. Under YETP youths are eligible to participate if they are unemployed or underemployed, or come from a low income family. In determining whether youths are underemployed, intake specialists use the poverty level criterion established by the Office of Management and Budget. In determining whether youths are from low income families, the 85 percent of the lower living standard criterion, developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is used. The two standards vary unevenly, making different adjustments for metropolitan (or nonfarm) and nonmetropolitan (farm) areas. The BLS standard makes some adjustments for regional variations, while the OMB standard does not. If the criteria are taken seriously, the administrative difficulties can be cumbersome. One administrator complained that "it is very difficult to juggle all of these variables -- especially out in the field." (Vernon Briggs, Page B-15).

Substitution

YEDPA has important value as a demonstration effort and as a tool for accomplishing some institutional change. The hope is that an investment now will yield future payoffs in more productive programs. But the programmatic emphasis on creating jobs and training opportunities for youth now, cannot be overstated. YEDPA is an employment program that was passed partly in response to higher youth unemployment rates in general, and the alarming jobless rates for nonwhite youths, especially.

As ambitious as YEDPA is, it is small relative to the scale of the youth population and unemployment problems. There are more than 18 million youths in the 16-24 age bracket, and more than two and a half million of them are unemployed. The rest are working or out of the labor force. YEDPA is expected to serve about 300,000 youths in its first year. Because of the limited impact it could have under the best of conditions, Congress and the Department of Labor have taken steps to focus programs where they will have the greatest net effects. Targeting by employment status and income offers some assurances that YEDPA services and jobs will go to those more in need and to those less likely to have alternative sources of assistance.

But targeting alone does not maximize impact. There is also a concern that the YEDPA resources should add on to the institutional provisions already benefiting youth, and not simply substitute for what is already being provided. To the extent that YEDPA resources replace CETA Title I money that sponsors would have earmarked for youth, or replace LEA resources that are already available, the net addition to youth resources is negligible. For these reasons, there are legislative provisions and departmental regulations and directives that limit prime sponsors if they try to cut back on Title I services already being provided to youth, and backfilling with YEDPA resources. YEDPA states that YCCIP and YETP are intended to be "supplementary to but not replacing opportunities available under Title I of this act." (Sections 331 and 341 of YEDPA). Regulations, and directives spell out in further detail the level of effort that sponsors must maintain in serving youth under other parts of CETA.

Prime sponsors are also being encouraged to maximize the impact of the limited YCCIP and YETP resources by piggybacking the extra administrative chores on agents already in place, by coupling the YCCIP and YETP support network with support networks available under other CETA activities and through local government agencies, and by tapping non-CETA resources wherever they are available.

Factors Diminishing the Impact of YEDPA

The original design for this interim report included a focus on learning about whether prime sponsors are "substituting" YEDPA resources for

Title I resources that had previously been supporting youth activities. The methodology consisted of determining whether prime sponsors were maintaining the same level and the same mix of Title I services to youth between January 1 and March 31, 1978, as they had in the same period during 1977 (the interval established by the Department of Labor as the base period). For prime sponsors whose Title I funding decreased, the "same level of services" constituted an equal proportion of youth being served. For those whose funding remained the same or increased, the "same level of services" meant an equal number of youth being served.

Problems were encountered and issues emerged, however, that undercut the validity of that crude methodology, and refocused attention on some other areas where substitution was emerging in different guises.

Based on the sketchy data that were available for analysis, prime sponsors are not using the newly available youth resources to substitute for services they were previously providing to youth under Title I. In some areas like Oregon Balance of State, Portland, and Boston, the number of youth served under Title I dropped, but the proportion of Title I youth recipients did not. This was due to reductions in Title I allocations. Boston experienced an especially sharp reduction in its Title I allocation. To fill the void left by the cut, the regional office granted permission to switch over much of Boston's Title I services that had been going to youth, to funding under YETP. Consequently, the only identifiable impact attributable to YETP has been the centralized intake office (still to be established) and the LEA activities that were newly established. Charlotte was another prime experiencing a Title I allocation reduction. But there the number and proportion of youth in Title I activities actually increased.

Most sponsors, however, have not experienced such cuts in Title I funding and have maintained service to youth under other titles. In fact, in some cases, the introduction of YEDPA has had an effect opposite to that which the Department of Labor feared. Albuquerque, Coastal Bend and El Paso are three sponsorships where planners felt youth were being squeezed out of CETA. The interest there is on increasing youth enrollments in other CETA titles. Albuquerque, with its Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project, its in-school Title I program, YCCIP and YETP, now is serving more youth than non-youth. With the flow of vast resources, it is turning the problems of youth into a new and significant priority on its manpower agenda. Santa Clara is experiencing a similar effect. Since YEDPA, the prime sponsor has established a Youth Division. In addition to running the YETP and YCCIP programs for youth, the division may be able to increase Title I programming for youth as well.

No matter what methodology may be adopted for gauging the extent of substitution, important qualifications should be attached to the findings, for two reasons. First, CETA enrollment data are set up in such a way as to create considerable distortion in the picture of the actual number of persons served. This question of data validity is important, but is not taken up here. Another reason for proceeding very carefully in analyzing substitution findings is that the regulations restricting prime sponsor discretion in changing service levels and program mix for different client

groups, may not be appropriate. As the regulations stand now, "significant change in local conditions" is the only criterion for change accepted by the Department of Labor. The problem is that, frequently, there is no data adequate for describing changes in local conditions.

First, accurate data for describing local conditions -- and the changes that might justify program shifts -- are rarely available. As the first interim report amply demonstrated, prime sponsors simply cannot get accurate estimates for the current universe of need, or for services already available. For example, Chicago, while increasing the youth share of Title I services, was reducing the number of youths served because of too little change in adult unemployment. Planners there were hinging Title I services for adults on the adult unemployment rate, and the persistence of the adult unemployment rate. Chicago's policy is clearly in accordance with the letter of the substitution directives because it does not reduce the youth share of Title I services. But, the reasoning used would not hold up to DOL scrutiny if Chicago were "substituting" as DOL defines it.

Data on the prime sponsor universe of need and local conditions is of questionable accuracy and validity. This alone undercuts the appropriateness of the DOL policy to prevent substitution. But there are other variables at work influencing the prime sponsor decision to change program service and delivery patterns. Drop-out rates, wage rates for youth, contractor performance, and simply increased prime sponsor understanding of local conditions can all dictate change. In Cobb County, a Title I Nurses' Assistant Training class may be absorbed in the local school system, leaving more than 200 Title I slots open. There is no guarantee that CETA administrators will be able to contract for youth services on such a large scale, with any other local organization. In Northeast Georgia, the new, efficiently-run YETP program is making an established Title I in-school program look so bad by comparison, that there is a danger the Title I program may be eliminated. Again, it is not clear that the CETA prime sponsor may not find itself in technical violation of the substitution guidelines.

No one can argue with the Congress and Department of Labor's goal to maximize the impact of YEDPA by reducing substituion. But what is at question is the way in which DOL is enforcing the non-substitution mandate. Unless the Department of Labor can devise an all encompassing test capturing the effect of all the local variables that may be influential in shaping client mix, perhaps there should be greater reliance on prime sponsor discretion. This vote of confidence might be especially desirable because it appears that there are other forms of substitution whose effects may be swamping any YEDPA-for-Title I substitution, and which cannot be controlled effectively from the national level. A vote of confidence in prime sponsors may give them more of a vested interest in controlling these other variations of substitution.

Other Forms of Substitution

The Title I substitution that DOL is hoping to discourage is negligible. It is not clear whether that is due to the efforts of DOL to discourage substitution, or is more akin to the effect of the New Yorker who snapped his fingers to keep wild elephants from attacking him -- which, indeed, they did not do. Regardless of what is at work, there are some other "substitution" effects which bear closer scrutiny, because they too are diminishing the effects of YEDPA.

In Charlotte, an employment service recruiter noted that she was having greater difficulty developing slots for the summer program, because potential employers had already developed slots for YEDPA youth. It remains to be seen whether the employment service will be able to develop enough jobs to take up all the slots available. There is also some concern about whether in-school vocational education program slots will displace cooperative education slots developed before, for which employers paid.

In Hartford, project areas that had been receiving community development block grants are now receiving YCCIP money as well. There is speculation now that the community development block grant money may be shut off because of the influx of YCCIP funds. When community development money ran down for another program sponsored by the Hartford Board of Education, YETP was used to sustain services. There is good reason to believe that the locally controlled block grant money was shut off in anticipation of the YETP money. In both cases, if YEDPA money simply replaces block grant money, there will be little net increase in resources for youth unless the suspended block grant funds go to support youth activities somewhere else.

There is also evidence that YEDPA funds that are going to schools are sometimes being substituted for funds already available. But frequently there are qualitative changes in the services provided. In Boston, a previously existing school program for retarded youths is having its hour extended and its supervisory staff augmented. Albuquerque schools are extending their summer-only internships for post-secondary students, to year-round. But in some cases, minor changes may be just a cover for substitution. A LEA in Cook County, for example, is shifting some students currently enrolled in vocational education programs, into YETP. In other areas, schools are extending counseling services to students who have not traditionally benefited from them, but by right, have been entitled to them all along. However, even in the cases where there may be YEDPA dollars going to support school services already available, qualitative changes in the services that schools provide, and the students to whom they provide them, may have long-term effects that offset the substitution of federal dollars for local dollars.

Behavior that diminishes the apparent impact of YEDPA is not solely an institutional phenomenon. Youths themselves play a role. They are able to influence client mix by their service seeking strategies. Staffers at the Chicago Board of Education, for instance, are concerned

that youths may shun Title I for its shorter hours, and seek out Title III jobs instead. The effect that YEDPA is having on labor force participation may be much more significant, and could seriously mask the effects of YEDPA on aggregate youth employment figures. The data available so far indicate that YEDPA is having the effect of increasing labor force participation among eligible youths. This is showing up when prime sponsors enroll youth who are neither unemployed nor underemployed. This pattern is not definite. Data from prime sponsors is not complete (See Table 4). The variability in the data from prime sponsor to prime sponsor also suggests that there might be different definitions being applied. But if the available data are accurate enough for indicating rough orders of magnitude, it might be inferred that an enormous proportion of YEDPA resources are going to youths who would not otherwise be working or be looking for work. This, by itself, is not necessarily an undesirable effect. Labor force participation rates among many youth subgroups are disturbingly low and dropping among economically disadvantaged minority youth especially. Any program that has the effect of raising labor force participation among these groups is clearly desirable. What is not clear yet, however, is whether the increase in participation rates is greatest among those who have recently been participating the least.

If, indeed, YEDPA is increasing labor force participation among some segments of the target group, two implications are worth noting. First, the effect of YCCIP and YETP on reducing youth unemployment rates may be even less than the programs' scale originally suggested. This would indicate that policymakers should be very circumspect in the way that they look for the effect of YEDPA in reported unemployment. A second implication is that Department of Labor youth policy can have a quick and drastic effect on labor force behavior of youth. This would imply that such questions as, for example, the effect of YCCIP jobs on drop-out rates, are of much more than just academic interest. It would also dictate a great deal of caution in balancing in-school and out-of-school services so that students are not encouraged to quit school.

Coordinating Services for Youth

Substitution can be seen, in loose terms, as anything that diminishes the potential impact of YEDPA by using YEDPA to provide something that would have been provided otherwise. The other side of the coin is the coordination of services for youth that stretches the impact of YEDPA by taking advantage of resources already available. The coordination of services for youth resolves around two areas of concern. The first is the institutional linkages tying YEDPA activities to those of other agencies -- CETA and non-CETA alike. The second is the programmatic linkages between YEDPA activities and the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (SPEDY). Both topics are considered here, although the second will be evaluated in more detail in the third interim report.

The Congress and the Department of Labor see YEDPA as marking only a limited increase in resources, and as a provisional measure.

Table 4

Labor Force Status of Participants at time of Enrollment

	YETP			YCCIP		
	Unemployed	Under-employed	Other	Unemployed	Under-employed	Other
California						
Marin						
Oakland						
Santa Clara/San Jose						
San Francisco						
Sonoma						
Connecticut						
BOS	250	24	28	83	1	56
Hartford Consortium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Waterbury	88	0	45	15	0	5
Georgia						
BOS	0	0	299	NA	NA	NA
Atlanta	786	0	0	108	0	0
Cobb County	49	0	21	37	0	4
DeKalb County	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois						
Chicago	1532	27	1851	159	1	73
Cook County	206	2	0	51	0	0
Rockford	62	2	410	28	0	3
Massachusetts						
Boston						
Eastern Middlesex						
Worcester						
Michigan						
Detroit						
Grand Rapids	18	0	723	27	0	0
Kalamazoo County	99	2	0	6	0	0
Lansing Tri-County	70	6	569	28	10	9
Muskegon						
New Mexico						
Albuquerque	0	0	91	0	3	51
North Carolina						
BOS	3416	420	3165	222	0	0
Alamance County	167	2	0	18	0	0
Charlotte	250	0	0	18	0	0
Durham-Orange County	66	8	45	17	0	1
Ohio						
Clark County	112	1	67	15	0	14
Columbus-Franklin	440	1	0	99	0	0
Greene County	2	0	11	1	0	4
Oregon						
BOS	215	9	41	20	1	0
Lane County	49	6	125	21	1	0
Portland	156	13	44	13	0	0
Texas						
Coastal Bend	61	1	137	NA	NA	NA
El Paso	188	3	189	0	0	35
Washington						
Kitsap County	50	6	1	11	0	2

Accordingly, they have intended for the new youth programs to build on other services as much as possible. This was seen as a way to stretch YEDPA dollars and also as a way to facilitate future adaptations as youth strategies are modified. However, the coordination of CETA services with non-CETA services is not a novel idea. It has been encouraged since the advent of CETA and even before CETA. Unfortunately, it has previously met with only limited success.

Youth Inventories

As one way to improve the chances of success for the YEDPA coordination measures, the Department of Labor required prime sponsors to develop an inventory of available youth services. The inventory was intended to identify both local government agencies as well as organizations outside the public sector. Regulations also required each prime sponsor to specify the nature of its linkages with these other organizations in its youth plan.

Most prime sponsors duly assembled their youth services inventories. But in most cases, the exercise was a pro forma and perfunctory one. Time did not permit careful research, and consequently many of them are only listings of organizations with whom everyone was familiar. The formats of many of the inventories are sufficient to satisfy the Department of Labor, but are not suited as a tool for program planning, or as a reference catalogue for referring youths to services.

Most prime sponsors considered compiling the inventories to be a waste of time. But many felt that way because they had already developed extensive listings of local service deliverers. A California youth director found the existing listings far superior to anything that could have been put together in the brief time before the youth programs started. In Rockford, the dearth of private agencies made the development of a youth inventory a simple, but largely unnecessary, task. There were a few cases, however, where persons found the inventories useful. One prime sponsor in North Carolina claimed that the inventory provided information that would not have otherwise been available. A program operator elsewhere saw the inventory as being useful for identifying services that could be tied to CETA. The latter case involved a person who was new to CETA activities.

The inventories were prepared by most sponsors after the fiscal 1978 plans were prepared. Consequently, use of the inventories was limited. If the present inventories have much use, it will be in connection with the 1979 programs. However, local experience suggests that most prime sponsors have already established fairly extensive linkages with local organizations capable of serving youth. Although organized listings may be lacking, the players are aware of one another. Most of the prime sponsors have a wealth of local experience on which to draw. While the youth service inventories may have been useful earlier in the course of prime sponsor development -- indeed, many developed just such a listing some time ago -- they are redundant for most now.

Coordinating Services

One of the effects of YEDPA has been to prod some prime sponsors into creating separate youth offices. Among other things, they seem to promise more coordination with non-CETA deliverers, although it is not always true that they encourage coordination within the CETA offices. The Connecticut Balance of State prime sponsor created a new unit to handle administrative affairs pertaining to YEDPA. However, youth program operations continue to be run alongside other CETA operations. Other prime sponsors opted for more change. San Francisco and Oakland both established a centralized intake for youth enrolling in YETP. Three other California sponsors -- Marin, Sonoma and Santa Clara -- went so far as to establish separate youth divisions.

Albuquerque set up a novel one-stop office that assumes responsibility for handling all youth services directly, making referrals to other service deliverers. The youth office is attempting to streamline delivery of services while humanizing the process by assigning a counselor to handle all matters for each youth. Boston has plans for a similar comprehensive service intake office. It probably will not be operational, though, until next year. Atlanta established a youth intake and referral office in addition to a Title III office that is coordinating and administering YETP, YCCIP and SPEDY.

Other prime sponsors are choosing an incremental approach, integrating the activities of YEDPA with their ongoing operations. In Washington and Oregon, prime sponsors are modifying their organizations just to meet new needs, such as linking up with local schools. The balance of the services is provided within the framework of their existing structures. Prime sponsors in Michigan are adopting a similar posture. There is an "extended range of cooperation ... rather than the development of new administrative and programmatic linkages, that typifies relations among ... prime sponsors and contractors." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-55).

Regardless of the administrative approach prime sponsors have taken in response to YEDPA, fairly extensive coordination with outside agencies seems to be the rule. Both the Connecticut Balance of State and the Waterbury prime sponsors rely fully on the Employment Service to handle all their certification duties. Some of the CBOs under contract with those sponsors have worked out informal service arrangements with a number of state agencies, for such services as vocational rehabilitation. Sponsors in Washington and Oregon arrnage services on the basis of informal agreements and ongoing working relationships, with a myriad of organizations. They include community colleges, residential facilities for youth, alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs, welfare and children's service agencies, vocational rehabilitation divisions, public health agencies, V.D. and family planning clinics, food stamp offices, legal service agencies, and the employment service. In Rockford, the Employment Service handles some of the intake paperwork in exchange for CETA employees. Chicago receives Employment Service assistance for eligibility verification. In Cook County, the Employment Service helps absorb the overflow for contractors unable to

generate sufficient placement slots. The Greene County prime sponsor has arranged non-financial agreements with the Employment Service, the joint vocational school, the community action agency, a local college and other organizations. Muskegon gets assistance from the local Urban League in writing OJT contracts for one of the major YEDPA contractors. Muskegon also received assistance from the local Hartman Institute in developing and administering tests as part of the intake process. Kalamazoo succeeded in establishing linkages between the state social service agency and school counselors.

There are "compromise" approaches to coordination that prime sponsors have adopted. In Cobb County and Northeast Georgia, sponsors have favored a single agent for handling YETP, in the interest of preventing fragmentation of services. This was done because the lack of time worked against prime sponsors doing much coordination and because relatively small numbers of youth were involved.

Tying SPEDY in with YCCIP and YETP

Generally prime sponsors are trying to connect SPEDY to their Title I youth activities, YETP, and to a limited extent, YCCIP. Linkages will be marked more by administrative shifts in funding sources for jobs, than by changes in program components. But one change noticeable to youths in SPEDY will be an increase in supportive services over those provided in previous SPEDY programs. In Lansing, the emphasis will be on keeping Title I, YCCIP and YETP youths in the same jobs and supportive activities. Clark County is taking a similar approach. It is trying to mesh year-round activities with SPEDY, providing summer youth with YETP services. In Cook County, YETP and YCCIP enrollees will have their work week extended and be given opportunities for vocational exploration. Atlanta will be bringing in some of its new YETP contractors to run their summer programs. In-school youth on YETP and YCCIP will have their hours extended. All SPEDY enrollees will benefit from a greater emphasis on career exploration.

One of the most ambitious plans for linking SPEDY with year-round activities, can be found in Grand Rapids. There, planners are hard at work on next year's SPEDY program, because they are trying to consolidate YETP and YCCIP into a coordinated, twelve-month program. Already they are preparing a consolidated Request for Proposals that covers the three programs.

One exception to the way prime sponsors are trying to unify YEDPA and SPEDY, is found in Greene County, Ohio. There, planners are trying to use SPEDY as a complement to the year-round programs. Since YCCIP and YETP serve only youths 16 and over, SPEDY will concentrate on enrolling 14 and 15 year olds. Since YCCIP and YETP in Greene County emphasize service to school-leavers, SPEDY is being aimed at in-schoolers, who plan to return to school in the fall. The Greene County pattern is probably not seen elsewhere for two reasons. First, other sponsors are placing less

emphasis on serving 14-15 year olds. Second, other sponsors have more of a balance between those in school and those out-of-school, in their year-round programs.

The general interest among prime sponsors is to run YETP (and sometimes YCCIP) into SPEDY, possibly increasing hours, but hopefully maintaining the same job sites. There are some obstacles, however. One is the differing eligibility criteria. YCCIP and YETP enrollees who are above the income cut-off for SPEDY eligibility, will not be able to move into SPEDY funded jobs (or have their job extended with SPEDY money). However, this is not expected to present serious difficulties since prime sponsors have been concentrating on enrolling economically disadvantaged, and since delays in implementation of YEDPA are leaving prime sponsors with some lag funds.

A more serious obstacle to merging YEDPA and SPEDY jobs is the differences in wages under the different programs. SPEDY jobs are occasionally paying more. Where they do, prime sponsors expect to be facing situations where YCCIP and YETP youth will be trying to quit their jobs to get more money with SPEDY. Whether sponsors can adjust wages adequately or devise administrative mechanisms to prevent participant program-hopping, remains to be seen.

Prime sponsors are making an effort to make connections between SPEDY and YEDPA. In the cases where the connection is not being made, the failure seems to be a function of pressing circumstances. Columbus, for example, has barely moved in its implementation of YEDPA, so coordination with SPEDY is a moot point. Detroit, still struggling with its massive entitlement project, has had no time to think about linking SPEDY with YEDPA. For the moment, it is concentrating simply on implementing SPEDY as a separate program and the entitlement project. But even in these cases, it does not appear as though the lack of linkages is going to leave any YEDPA youth jobless during the summer.

Holding Down Overhead on the Youth Programs

The tight limits on administrative costs make it all the more necessary for prime sponsors to coordinate services and try other mechanisms for cutting overhead. If YCCIP and YETP were established independent of other CETA operations, they would attract few takers. YETP activities have a fairly tight 20 percent limit on administrative costs. YCCIP activities have a stingy 5 percent lid on administrative costs. In fact, many prime sponsors had a great deal of difficulty contracting for YCCIP projects in the fall and winter.

Prime sponsors were encouraged to reduce overhead costs by begging, borrowing, or stealing whatever facilities, services, money or supplies they could. Virtually all of them have succeeded to some extent. Some have had extraordinary success.

YETP programs almost everywhere are enjoying the benefits of at least some free space, telephone service, and administrative support from schools, and CBOs, as well as other CETA programs. Public service employees are frequently used as supervisors. The employment service offices have been especially cooperative in providing outreach, screening, and eligibility determination services. They have provided free testing, and in some cases are conducting job development and placement programs. Much of the outside support has been absolutely essential. It is hard to imagine many of the YETP programs functioning at any level of effectiveness without that support. This level of cooperation is noteworthy.

The extent of cooperation for YCCIP projects has been especially impressive in a few cases. It reflects a great deal of ground work by prime sponsors and delivery agents.

A YCCIP building renovation project in Hartford joined an ongoing community effort. It is working on one building that had been scheduled for demolition, but was sold, instead, to a league of community organizations. With the help of local banks, the Public Housing Corporation in Hartford mortgaged the building -- at below market interest rates -- to help pay for renovation supplies. The YCCIP project is working on another building that is being leased for below market rates.

In Rockford, the prime sponsor and the CBO in charge of a stadium renovation project, have succeeded in amassing an estimated $100,000 worth of cash contributions, donated services, and donated supplies. That does not include the stadium and property. In another exemplary joint effort, the Greene County (Ohio) prime sponsor is sponsoring an $18,000 YCCIP winterization project. A county high school and the local village are matching that $18,000 with $36,000 in supervisory costs and materials.

Prime sponsors are also tapping federal resources available through other programs. In the Connecticut Balance of State, CBOs are purchasing supplies with cash contributions. Transportation services are provided at no cost through a regional minibus demonstration project funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation. In several areas where YCCIP weatherproofing projects are underway, the Community Services Administration is extensively involved, supplying technical assistance and supplies.

Attempts to reduce overhead and stretch YEDPA resources are paying off -- handsomely in some cases. Aside from leveraging the YEDPA resources into some well-supported activities, the efforts are also succeeding in broadening the base of community support of the projects. In Rockford and Greene County, for example, much more is at stake than some federal dollars. Local, non-CETA actors have a stake in the action. It is only a short step from there to the understanding that they have a stake in the future of the youth from their communities.

Involvement of Community Based Organizations

Under CETA, the selection of program agents can assume an importance rivaling the selection of target groups. CETA funds, of course, represent valuable dollar resources. The choice of who gets those dollar resources to run programs is an important matter of economic efficiency. But CETA dollars also stand for political resources. The shift from categorical programs of the 1960s to CETA, shifted resources and power towards state and local governments, away from many community based groups representing minority groups, impoverished, and disenfranchised persons who had little effective access to traditional political power structures. Hence, the advent of CETA marked, in many minds, the potential for a significant shift in the balance of power -- economic as well as political power -- away from the disenfranchised. To keep this from happening, CETA legislation included provisions requiring prime sponsors to give CBOs "due consideration," when selecting service delivery agents. YEDPA has strengthened the language, requiring prime sponsors to give CBOs "special consideration" in involving them in program planning and service delivery.

The first report of local YEDPA experience documents the nature of the "special consideration" prime sponsors gave CBOs, and the effect it has had on involving them in delivering youth services. This report begins the process of assessing the differential impact CBOs can have as service deliverers.

Do CBOs Have an Edge?

Given the attention focused on CBOs and what appears to be a noticeable increase in their participation, an inevitable question is: What difference does their participation make? Do they, in fact, represent a different point of view? Do they, in fact, reach persons who would not otherwise be served? Do they provide different services, or can they provide better services?

The evidence collected in the course of observations made during the spring is certainly not definitive. However, it seems to support the conclusion that there is very little to distinguish CBOs from other service deliverers with respect to cost, target group penetration, or effectiveness as program deliverers. There appears to be a full range of variations between CBOs, and hardly any systematic variations between CBOs as a group and other service deliverers.

Cost comparisons between CBOs and non-CBOs are inconclusive. The "special consideration" provision in YEDPA raised the ire of some prime sponsor officials who claimed the clause would raise their costs. But when prime sponsors were pressed for hard evidence, none was forthcoming. The only valid observation is that, to the extent CBOs are frequently small organizations unable to achieve economies of scale, program costs are higher. But, since CBOs vary in size and include some of the largest program

delivery agents under YEDPA, that criticism does not hold across the board. One presumed advantage of governmental service deliverers is the opportunity they present for piggybacking CETA activity on other agency work, at little cost to CETA. Yet many CBOs, enjoying a broad base of financial support for delivering a range of services, can frequently achieve the same economies.

Under YEDPA there is a mixed verdict on the differential effectiveness of CBOs in penetrating particular target groups and serving them. Where CBOs do their own outreach and intake, they do not appear necessarily to have an edge over other outreach/intake arrangements. In some cases this might be attributable to them having become as much a part of the local establishment as any government agency. But it usually appears to be because youth learn quickly about program opportunity, and the outreach/intake function does not prove to be a critical component. There is some speculation that schools, because of their proximity to the in-school youth population, are relatively better adapted to performing outreach/intake for in-school programs. But that advantage, if it exists, is offset by the success that CBOs have in identifying and enrolling out-of-school youth.

The question of whether CBOs are more effective or less effective than others in reaching youth in need is proving to be a moot point in many prime sponsorships under YEDPA. Sponsors are shifting to centralized intake and assessment centers, and CBOs and other program agents do not pick up the action until youths are referred to them.

With regards to their effectiveness as program operators, it is again impractical to attempt to classify CBOs as a group. There are too many variations among them. One serious charge made against them is that their work experience and too much of their training capacity is geared to public sector work. But the same holds for the governmental deliverers.

One sign of enhanced CBO effectiveness is their progressive integration with the local service network. There appears to be a greater willingness to refer CBO enrollees to other institutions, most notably, local schools. The major LEA role under YEDPA has contributed to this. But, it appears that there has also been some lessening of tension that arose from past criticism of the job schools were doing in serving disadvantaged youth.

In short, under YEDPA, the CBO role is hardly distinguishable as such. CBOs appear to be very much a part of the local service delivery mainstream. But this argues in favor of continued preferential treatment. Indeed, past preferential treatment seems to have been instrumental in moving CBOs to the position they are in now. The lack of distinguishing CBO traits might be seen as indicating some sort of equilibrium.

Changes in Institutional Relationships

The isolation theme is persistent in elements of youth employment problems: isolation of schools from employers, isolation of youths from

school, isolation of the CETA system from schools, and isolation of youths from work. The toll of this isolation is high. Schools and employers have faulty perceptions about what each other does, and have unrealistic expectations about what each other might do for students. Youths too frequently have unrealistic career goals, have few ideas about how to fulfill the realistic ones, and have distorted views of employment and the world of work. Economically disadvantaged youth suffer the effects of isolation even more. Frequently concentrated in substandard schools and in labor surplus areas, an education leaves them with nothing more than a diploma, and little prospects for decent employment.

The isolation theme is significant for what it implies about the real impact that schools, employers, and youth themselves can have on the problems of youth employment, when they act alone. Singly, they can do very little. CETA can have little luck with job development and placement programs for persons who cannot read. The most civic minded employer will go bankrupt hiring unskilled and uneducated workers for jobs demanding persons skilled in crafts. The most advanced high school is bound to perform poorly in placing youths in jobs if it does not heed the needs of employers.

Recognizing the gulf separating important players with a role in solving youth employment problems, the Congress and the Department of Labor have fashioned YEDPA as a tool for institutional change. Provisions in YETP and YCCIP were designed, not just to improve the capabilities of schools and the CETA establishment to provide more support within their systems, but to encourage the kinds of institutional interaction necessary to facilitate the transition for youth between educational institutions and employment and training establishments, and employers and the world of work. Furthermore, prime sponsors are encouraged to establish linkages with unions and private businesses for providing services and for providing jobs. Plans for these linkages are supposed to be included in prime sponsor youth plans.

The biggest emphasis on institutional linkages, though, is between local education agencies (LEAs) and CETA prime sponsors. Although YEDPA sponsors did not presume a total absence of CETA-LEA cooperation, they did presume that in most areas, linkages were incomplete. To foster institutional ties, a minimum of 22 percent of each sponsor's YETP allocation is reserved for programs operated under the authority of agreements between prime sponsors and LEAs. Sponsors are additionally encouraged to gain cooperation of LEAs in arranging for academic credit for YETP and YCCIP work experience.

In the first report on YEDPA experience at the local level, prime sponsors, almost universally, were found to be interested in, and in the process of arranging CETA-LEA agreements. By mid-spring, details of most of the agreements had been resolved, programs were in place and they were operating. However, all has not been smooth sailing from there. Developing and implementing the LEA agreements has raised many problems. There are question marks about next year. Much stands in the way of a fully productive relationship between local CETA agents and the LEAs, although some significant first steps have been made.

Making the Connection Between CETA and Local Schools

Cooperation between prime sponsors and local schools is not an untried concept. In many areas, there is a history of joint efforts that pre-dates CETA. CETA sponsors in Chicago and Cook County have been talking and working with educators there for years. The school system in both areas has acted as program agent many times. The same is true in Atlanta, Marin County, San Francisco and Oakland to name a few. Some schools are as tuned into CETA as the prime sponsors. In Detroit, one CETA official noted "/t/he Board of Education knew how much YEDPA money we were getting before we did." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-40).

Most prime sponsors, however, started with no established links. They and their respective local schools had operated in relative isolation, in spite of their supposed common interest: preparing youths for adulthood. A few primes started with strikes against them: a history of bad feelings between prime sponsors and LEAs. School districts in Sonoma have been hostile towards CETA for years and have shown little inclination to serve some of the prime YEDPA targets: dropouts, potential dropouts, and other problem youths. There were bad feelings between LEAs and the CETA office in Charlotte arising from a scandal over the misuse by a few individuals of CETA summer funds.

In cases where there have been few precedents for CETA-LEA cooperation, the substance of the agreements is still at a very tentative stage. Policy seems to have taken a backseat for the moment, to more pressing operational matters of hammering out the framework for LEA agreements, appointing persons to administer programs and identifying and enrolling program participants. As the programs encompassed by the agreements are established, there is certain to be more attention to the large policy issues. Then changes may be made. This is not to say that joint CETA-LEA activities are devoid of substance. Some have been carefully considered. But some of the policy issues behind the interest in institutional change have not been very well articulated by local planners, and change appears to be, to some extent, the product of chance.

In a few areas, officials seem to have a grasp for the significance of strong links between the manpower establishment and the education establishment. In North Carolina, the full State Board of Education and the North Carolina Employment and Training Council sat down together for the first time ever. Governor James Hunt took part in the meeting, urging cooperation "to help coordinate a state-wide effort to forge an unbroken link for youths between school and work." (R. C. Smith, Page H-19). Schools in North Carolina Balance of State are receiving approximately 60 percent of the sponsorship's YETP allocation. The Balance of State prime sponsor is also closely monitoring LEA activities and is pushing joint program activities and services tied to other CETA programs. The state has also gone so far as to include a provision explicitly prohibiting LEAs from supplanting YEDPA funds for state or local funds.

Sensitivity to the need or to the potential for closer CETA-LEA ties is not universal, however. The first reaction of the Oregon State Department of Education to one county's proposal for augmenting its CETA-LEA project was discouraging. The State Department of Education objected to a proposal for a career exploration and experience component. As a departmental committee put it, the objection was based "... not so much on the proposal itself as on the involvement of CETA in the project." The feeling was that such a connection "endangered the possibility of program success, and greatly limited its tranportability." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-18). After some strong reaction to the committee report, a new letter was issued, retracting the earlier statement and affirming the belief of the department and the committee that "such linkages to various segments of the community are vital to vocational education in the state." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-18).

For the most part, there was an absence of a persuasive state role either encouraging or hindering LEA connections with CETA. The forum for establishing the CETA-LEA contact was usually at the local level, or between local (or county schools) and balance of state CETA offices.

Keeping in mind the usual cautions against generalizing about anything as decentralized and decategorized as CETA and the educational system, some patterns do emerge from the CETA-LEA experience so far. CETA-LEA agreements fall into two general groups. Those that set up LEAs as relatively autonomous program agents, and those that set up the LEAs as integral cogs in a coordinated system attempting to ease the transition of youths from school to work. The implications for institutional change vary between the two groups.

One characteristic of the autonomous LEA program agents, is the lack of concern for dropouts or graduates who lack even basic reading and math skills. Many of these persons find themselves getting little out of CETA job training, because of their poor education history. A hope of YEDPA sponsors was that CETA-LEA agreements would be instrumental in providing this population with a second shot at basic education opportunities. Frequently, this is not happening within the independent LEA programs. They are limited to expanding services or providing new services to students already within the school system. Marin County schools, receiving 40 percent of the county's YEDPA allocation, is focusing entirely on students, because both the LEA and CETA officials feel in-school youth have been shortchanged. Part of the rationale, however, in concentrating on in-schoolers is to prevent dropouts. Schools in the Grand Rapids consortium, receiving nearly half of the YETP allocation, are serving only current students. Dropouts go through a different channel and are served by community based organizations. A similar approach is followed in Kalamazoo. The comments of one Kalamazoo CBO staffer imply that the schools will continue the pattern: "Once he's out of the system, the schools feel that he's not their problem anymore." (Peter Kobrak, Page C-46).

By concentrating on students still in the system, it is not clear that the LEAs running autonomous programs are contributing in any substantial

way to achieving the broad goal of encouraging change in institutional relationships, or the more specific objective of bringing youth back to school. They do not appear to be doing much to change the nature of the institutional linkage between schools and employers, nor are they systematically complementing the service capability of prime sponsors.

However, even where schools are running relatively autonomous and isolated programs, there is solid evidence that there is at least one internal institutional change: the emphasis on bringing economically disadvantaged students into the mainstream of ongoing programs. The YETP-targeted youths are being included in career exploration, vocational training, and cooperative/distributive education programs in which they had not been participating before. The danger -- and this will bear watching -- is that schools will just go through the motions of enrolling them without taking the effort to provide the extra services these youths may need. If the schools have the capability and the interest in providing extra support, the newly enrolled youths may succeed. Some schools do show signs of taking this commitment seriously. Many schools are first providing youths with counseling and guidance services, and some work experience before they place them in more demanding cooperative education programs. But for the schools lacking the capacity to handle the special needs of some underachievers, the isolation from the extensive CETA support services may prove fatal to the effort.

In some areas, prime sponsors and schools are working out agreements that reflect a team approach. The implications for institutional change in those cases seem much more promising. Sometimes this strategy is deliberate. The Muskegon consortium requires all its contractors to enroll a proportion of dropouts, with the idea that they can be brought back into the educational system. The larger CBO contractor there is placing enrollees in a summer school program. One of the schools is enrolling dropouts in its Adult Education program. One of the consortium goals is to start dropouts in high school completion programs in September. The careful attention of the consortium's administrators to the role of LEAs as more than autonomous contractors provides promise for a comprehensive education-employment-training network for youth.

In other areas, that kind of network appears to be developing, but it appears to be more as a function of chance. In Sonoma County, there is a history of hostility between the school districts and CETA. Furthermore, the schools have not served potential dropouts well, and have ignored the plight of dropouts and problem students. This is showing signs of changing. Sonoma has a new CETA administrator, and the LEA agreement appears to be bringing schools and the CETA establishment together. The Coos County Intermediate Education District in the Oregon Balance of State prime sponsorship is developing a new program model linking high school occupational curricula to a program of career employment opportunities. The program, designed for high school dropouts and other non-students, consists of two components: enrolling youths in high school, GED programs, or community colleges, and placing them in individualized work experience slots. Portland school districts are running a work experience program for in-schoolers and out-of-schoolers, that steers dropouts towards

reenrolling. Drawing on a history of earlier cooperation with the prime sponsor, the schools are also offering extensive career development assistance services.

In areas like Portland, it appears that the kind of CETA-LEA linkages that national policymakers are hoping for, are already well on the way to being forged. In other areas, prime sponsors and LEAs seem a little further back in a process that could lead to substantially new relationships between the two. But a blueprint for change is lacking. In Cook County, for example, it appears that the prime sponsor is not succeeding in developing a jointly sponsored comprehensive system of service delivery. Despite prime sponsor encouragement to have the schools serve dropouts, only 1 out of the 5 agreements available for study provided for any services to dropouts. Only 1 of the other 4 was geared to provide remedial education. Neither prime sponsors nor LEAs are providing much leadership for strategic planning. Where leadership is present, the LEAs and/or prime sponsors are experiencing little success in steering other players towards building a system of complementary services. This syndrome -- so prevalent among the prime sponsors included in this study -- appears to be characteristic of first year operations. The notion of a blueprint for overall strategy may be premature. In the press to implement a large and complex program, prime sponsors and LEAs alike were swamped with a host of administrative demands. The development of LEA agreements consumed a great deal of time, and some prime sponsors used up the reservoir of good will just getting their feet in the door. They were not in the position to pursue some of the larger policy objectives that entailed complicating the already confusing administrative maze. In short, some of the goals national policymakers have attached to CETA-LEA agreements will have to wait. But with schools and CETA officials at least on talking terms, further refinements in the specific provisions of CETA-LEA agreement seem much more feasible now then they did a year ago.

Although progress to date, and the potential for further progress, is encouraging, prime sponsors and LEAs have encountered some common problems in negotiating CETA-LEA agreements: distrust, differences in standards, differences in perspective, and differences in organizational objectives. They are the kinds of differences inherent in the nature of changing institutional relationships. Short of changing human nature, there is little that can be done about many of these difficulties. They are part of the "ordeal of change."

There were also the inevitable time pressures that prime sponsors find themselves working with whenever a new CETA program is established. The planning process was telescoped into a few weeks and prime sponsors had to advertise for program contracts, review bids, and select performers, in a short period of time. Adding to the misery of prime sponsors were other CETA mandates, such as expanding public service employment quickly. Many also found it politically dangerous to ignore opportunities to apply for YEDPA discretionary money and YIEPP grants. Nearly all prime sponsors passed their deadlines for negotiating LEA agreements, with nothing on paper. The sponsors themselves were too busy, and the LEAs were not accustomed to moving quickly. Yet in spite of the difficulties and delays, the agreements have been completed for the programs ending September 30, 1978.

Negotiating details for the following year should prove easier in many respects. Prime sponsors will be contending with ongoing programs, and some basic formats for LEA-CETA cooperation have been established. The first year's experience, however, has highlighted some basic problems. They all trace back to the incompatibility between the prime sponsors' federally-linked program year and the LEAs' school year.

CETA runs on a fiscal year beginning October 1st. Schools usually operate on a fiscal year starting January 1st or July 1st. They also have an academic year that runs from September to June. The differences in the calendar have led to a number of problems. First, schools have difficulty hiring qualified persons they would otherwise be able to pick if the planning years were compatible. As it stands now, a school employee working in a YEDPA job must risk being out of work from October through December (or June, depending on the school's fiscal year) if YEDPA funding does not come through in October. Some schools are gambling, hiring persons, with commitments to keep them at least into January. This approach gives them more programming flexibility and permits greater program expansion. But any interruption in funding would be very disruptive, forcing layoffs and effectively isolating the new programs.

Other schools are not risking those hazards, and are instead, simply adding the YEDPA load to current teaching, counseling, and administrative loads. By using the same persons in the YEDPA activities as are in regular school programs, the latter strategy sometimes assures better integration of employment and education programs. But in the schools where employees already have heavy workloads, the extra burdens represent a hardship for teachers, counselors and administrators, and force them to give too little attention to YEDPA enrollees. Local decisionmakers have to balance the strengths and weaknesses of the minimal change approach, with the high costs of errors that are inherent in the former strategy.

Another problem arises from the lengthy lead-time that schools take for programming and budgeting. For example, schools in Muskegon and Kalamazoo traditionally complete planning in early spring -- just as YEDPA planning for fiscal year 1979 was starting. This is leaving little time for careful program development.

Schools are also encountering difficulty in coordinating class schedules for in-schoolers participating in YEDPA. Schedules for the fall semester are made up in the summer or spring, before YEDPA work and service schedules can be established. The summer vacation schedules for school personnel complicate the problem. This means that schedules must be juggled after the semester starts, a difficult and time consuming task.

In many areas the difficulty of synchronizing YEDPA activities to the school year is not expected to be a serious problem. In some areas, though, it is dimming the prospects of any joint efforts by prime sponsors and the schools. One CETA official noted emphatically: "It could be the difference in the long run between YEDPA's success and failure." (R. C. Smith, Page H-20).

CETA and the Private Sector

CETA has been criticized frequently for its emphasis on the public sector: training enrollees for public sector jobs and placing jobless persons in public service employment. With five of every six jobs being in the private sector, there is merit to the criticism. In fact, no one has deliberately stood in the way of CETA-private sector cooperation. There is great sentiment among CETA supporters at the national and local levels, favoring a closer prime sponsor tie to the private sector -- businesses and unions. But neither labor market conditions nor the institutional orientation of CETA, on one hand, or private employers, on the other hand, have fostered much cooperation.

YEDPA was written to encourage prime sponsors to change their orientation, making them more attractive, and receptive, to private sector interests. The first interim report of YEDPA at the local level demonstrated that prime sponsors are taking the initiative; but that private sector interests, for the most part, are not responding. There has been no dramatic change since that time. Neither does there seem to be much promise for any breakthrough, similar to the breakthrough with LEAs that now seems possible.

However, there is scattered evidence of some genuine contact, dialogue, and action. The progress is hardly a quantum leap, but it could presage the kind of modest, undramatic breakthrough that will mark change on this front. In Durham-Orange, local employers and other private sector representatives are cooperating with the prime sponsor and the local schools, in putting together a resource directory of experts to be used for career planning. In Cobb County, the training contractor, Industrial Technology Career Center, is associated with Lockheed. It is hoped that the connection may improve private sector placements in general. The City of Portland is contemplating buying training for CETA participants from major firms in the area. The Mayor of Portland is actively involved, trying to persuade corporate executives to back the youth programs. Two projects in Oregon have had substantial success with private businesses. In one project, half the YETP enrollees are in private sector OJT slots, thanks to an ambitious selling job by the project counselor. A YCCIP solar heating project has had the effect of stimulating private investment in the solar heating business. The new commercial activity should be able to absorb the YCCIP enrollees ready for placement in unsubsidized employment. In Lane County, LEA staff are expecting to be able to develop OJT contracts and to place YETP enrollees in private sector jobs. The feeling among LEA staffers is that they will have more success than the CETA system alone, "... because they represent a stable mainstream institution." (Bonnie Snedeker, Page I-19).

There may be a degree of bias in the judgment of the Lane County educators. But, it seems significant that so many of the cases of private sector links involve schools. This may be one more spillover from progress on the CETA-LEA front.

With a few notable exceptions, unions remain only peripherally involved with YEDPA. San Francisco's largest YCCIP project was union initiated and is union supported. It is a Painters' Apprenticeship program which would appear to have potential as a model, were it not for the fact that the conditions there, especially the union interest, seem to be more the ideal than the norm. In Oakland, after some initial union resistance, there is union support for its YCCIP programs. The unions plan to submit proposals for their own YCCIP project in FY 1979. However, unions, for the most part, continue to provide little affirmative support for YEDPA at the local level. More often than not, they make themselves heard only when their interests seem to be threatened.

The connections of YEDPA-related programs to private sector interests still have a long way to go. Private employers are frequently suspicious of CETA red tape. Child labor laws and insurance regulations frequently make it more difficult to hire youths, and put a damper on the willingness of private employers to get involved. Of course, the effects of a sluggish economy are critical. One attempt in Clark County to develop ten on-the-job training positions failed because no commitments could be made. But some basic institutional prejudices persist and also stand in the way of progress. An LEA project in Cook County that was going to rotate youths through private sector jobs was rejected by the DOL regional office. An industrial representative who was chairman of one youth planning council, resigned when state and federal officials told him that the youth programs were intended only to provide economic relief and assure constructive use of enrollees' time. The officials were not interested in his thoughts, as a representative of that area's largest employer, about what youths need to prepare themselves for employment.

Where biases like these persist in the CETA establishment, the youth initiatives can have only limited impact as tools for forging closer private sector links.

GPO 931-811